



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2007

No. 19

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 31, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL POMEROY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. John F. Ross, Pastor, Wayzata Community Church, Wayzata, Minnesota, offered the following prayer:

God of extravagant love, You give us Your kingdom and then bid us to live in such a way as to claim it. We celebrate in Your presence the ministry of all who give of themselves in service and love to others.

Enable us to break down any walls that may exist between us, discovering the magnificence of honesty and the splendor of community. Grant us understanding as we hope to be understood, caring as we hope to be cared for. May we never seek to get as much as to give, or self as much as servanthood. May we never seek glory for ourselves, but delight in You.

Bless us in the knowledge that while You have given us Your word, You have not given us all Your words but that You are indeed still speaking. Startle us with the truth that Your final word will be love. All this we pray in gratitude for Your all-encompassing grace.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GOODE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND DR. JOHN F. ROSS AS GUEST CHAPLAIN

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to welcome today's guest chaplain, the Reverend Dr. John Ross, Senior Minister of Wayzata Community Church in Wayzata, MN.

On behalf of the entire House, thank you, J.R., as Dr. Ross is known back home, for your moving and very timely prayer and for serving as guest chaplain here today.

I know Dr. Ross and his wonderful wife, Sheila, very well as Kathryn and I, our family are members of Wayzata Community Church. We are proud to call Dr. Ross our senior minister and grateful to call John and Sheila and their four wonderful children our dear friends.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. John Ross is a true servant-leader who personifies faith, compassion and service to people in need. Dr. Ross came to Wayzata Community Church in 2004, after a 14-year ministry in Columbus, OH. Our Wayzata Community Church

and indeed our entire Lake Minnetonka community are truly blessed by Dr. Ross' strong and principled leadership as well as his inspiring commitment to help people in need.

Every summer since 1996, Dr. Ross has led a mission of primarily young people to Mexico where they have built over 100 homes for the poorest of the poor. As one 8th grader from our church told me, J.R. not only talks the talk, he walks the walk. He is always the first one up the ladder in the morning and the last one down from the roof in the evening.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. John Ross is truly a man of God who lives out the Biblical command to love God, love others, and serve the least amongst us.

Thank you again, Dr. Ross. Thank you, J.R., for serving the House of Representatives today and for doing the Lord's work in our church and community every day.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five additional 1-minute speeches per side.

REMEMBERING FATHER PHILIP CASCIA

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, our community recently lost a treasure, a man whose reach extended to communities across the world for the last three decades. Father Phillip Cascia made an indelible mark on the lives of thousands, thousands of people at his parishes, like St. Anthony's Church in Prospect, CT, and indeed across the globe. His commitment to children and families was as strong as his reach was long.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1057

Father Cascia will long be remembered for many things. For starting the St. Vincent dePaul Society Shelter and Soup Kitchen in Waterbury, CT, not only the largest soup kitchen in Connecticut but also its largest homeless shelter, a thrift store, a mental health center; for when the United States State Department called upon him to help youth in St. Petersburg, Russia, paving the way for his work opening an orphanage for victims of earthquakes there; and for his work founding Intersport USA and other remarkable international exchange programs he started in Sao Paulo, Brazil, China and Vietnam, work that led this Congress, this body to nominate him for a Nobel Peace Prize.

Most of all, he will be remembered for being a builder of bridges. Mr. Speaker, Father Philip Cascia was never content to live his faith confined within the walls of his church. He reached out. Whether you knew him for a moment, a few months or a few decades, as I did, you were touched by his values and moved by his compassion. Few lived their faith with greater commitment, dignity and hope. Father Cascia will be missed, but he will always be remembered.

THE MOJAVE WATER AGENCY

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Mojave Water Agency formed in 1960 and based in Apple Valley, CA, serves the High Desert Region of San Bernardino County.

One of the agency's directors, my very good friend, Beverly Lowry, who joins us here today, represents Division 6. Bev has lived in Barstow for more than 30 years and has dedicated herself to public service.

She served on the agency's board of directors from 1973 to 1977 and again from 1989 to the present. Mrs. Lowry is a commissioner of the Mojave River Basin Area Watermaster. She has been on the board of the Barstow Heights Community Service District for 20 years, including 10 years as president. She has also served for 11 years on the Flood Control Advisory Committee for Zone 4 and has also been the Chair of the Veterans Home Support Foundation.

The legislation I introduce today will authorize the Mojave Water Agency's thoughtful Water Regional Management Plan. Bev Lowry and other directors, with the help of their dedicated staff, have worked since 2001 to formulate a Regional Water Management Plan that will provide water to this desert region for years to come. This is a great bill, and I am proud to introduce it today.

WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. President Bush says that he is going forward with his plan for a troop surge in Iraq regardless of what the Congress does and what the American people want. But Senator SPECTER was right when he said yesterday that the President is not the sole decider, that the future of this war is a joint and shared responsibility with this Congress. It is time the President realizes that Congress will no longer be asleep at the wheel while this war rages on.

You need only to read the Constitution to know that Congress has the power to decide the direction of this war. The Constitution gives Congress an array of war powers, including the power to declare war, to raise and support armies and make rules concerning captures on land and water. The Framers knew what they were doing in checks and balances. They intended that, by giving Congress the power to declare war, they had the authority to make decisions about the war's scope and duration.

Now is not the time for a troop surge. Now is the time for a real plan in Iraq. The Murtha Plan, which I support, stipulates a diplomatic surge instead of a troop surge. It is time for President Bush to realize that we all support our brave troops, but America does not support the war.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES CROOK COUNTY AND OREGON SCHOOL PROGRAMS

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties across America and 4,400 school districts.

For Crook County, OR, this means real cuts in jail beds, sheriffs' patrols, criminal prosecutions and the pursuit of methamphetamine cooks. These services were once funded by timber receipts, but, because of the virtual elimination of timber harvest, a county which once supported seven saw mills employing thousands of people does not have a single operating mill today.

Crook County Judge Scott Cooper says, "The Federal Government has been pursuing a comprehensive strategy of disinvestment in rural communities," and he is right.

Congress' inaction hurts our children, too. Central Oregonian Jeff Sanders, president of the Oregon School Boards Association, is here on Capitol Hill with us today pleading for Congress to act on the behalf of the 560,000 K-12 school children in Oregon.

My colleagues, Congress must keep the Federal Government's word to timbered communities and pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY GETTING RAVE REVIEWS FOR COMPLETING 100 HOURS AGENDA

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last November, the American people demanded a new direction for America. Democrats are now providing that new direction, consistently bringing with them more than 60 Republicans on all the major votes, and they are delivering results on the priorities of the American people. Let me quote from a random sample of newspapers around the country.

The Seattle Post Intelligencer wrote, "Well, slap us twice and call us Betty, the Democrats in Congress actually accomplished what they pledged to do, on schedule no less."

The Charlotte Observer concluded, "House Democrats are getting high marks from the public for their legislative moves in the first 100 hours of the new session of Congress. They are on the right road."

The South Florida Sun-Sentinel wrote, "Democrats in the House made good on their promise to pass significant legislation during their first 100 hours in power. Actually, it took less than that time to pass the six bills the House Democrats hailed as their top priorities. This belies the perception that nothing ever gets done in Washington."

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it is because they elected Democrats or because we put a woman in charge, but things are happening in this House, and they are all good.

LONE STAR VOICE: BORDER AGENT'S WIFE

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, on the lawless southern border, Border Patrol agents are routinely assaulted by illegals. They are shot at. They are run down by smugglers in trucks. Officers who daily risk their lives protecting America are not always protected by America.

As a border agent's wife writes me: "In Texas, agents are regularly assaulted, and no prosecution is sought. They are told their injuries are not severe enough to deem Federal prosecution. My husband and his partner were both shot while on duty. The criminal who shot them was never tried on Federal charges. Instead, he was tried by the State of Texas. Why is it when an agent doing his job injures a criminal, the highest level of prosecution is sought, but when agents are assaulted, rarely, if any, prosecution is sought?"

Why also is it that hundreds of drug smugglers flee to Mexico, but we never try to track them down until they will aid in prosecuting border agents? Those who do a difficult job of protecting our borders need all the help they can get."

Mr. Speaker, America needs to vigorously prosecute criminals who assault our border agents. After all, they are the first line of defense from the illegal invasion into our homeland.

And that's just the way it is.

WE NEED A COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM PACKAGE

(Ms. GIFFORDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make clear once again the immediate need for a comprehensive immigration reform package.

The L.A. Times yesterday reported that seven of the largest tunnels discovered under the U.S.-Mexico border in recent years have still yet to be filled in. This troubles me for many reasons, not the least of which because smugglers have tried to use these passages before.

We need to work in a bipartisan fashion to end illegal immigration. And we have to focus our attention on those who wish to do America harm, whether they are drug smugglers, human smugglers or terrorists.

President Bush made it very clear last week in the State of the Union address that we need to have a serious civil and conclusive debate on illegal immigration. I agree, and I look forward to doing just that, working with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do just that.

My district in southern Arizona continues to bear the brunt of the crisis, whether it is in our schools, our law enforcement, our first responders or in our hospitals. It is time to do what is necessary to secure the border now.

□ 1015

SOCIAL SECURITY TOTALIZATION AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

(Mr. GOODE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2004, the United States Social Security Commissioner and the Director General of the Mexican Social Security Institute entered into a Social Security totalization agreement between Mexico and the United States.

The U.S. has totalization agreements with 20 other countries. However, all of these, except Canada, are with countries a substantial distance away. As a result, they involve relatively few workers and have little or no impact on illegal immigration. Unfortunately, the Mexican totalization agreement will be a huge incentive for increased illegal immigration.

Under this agreement, if there is amnesty and a glide path to citizenship, illegal aliens will be able to qualify their work in the United States for Social Security funds. This would result in a huge increase in Social Security costs for the United States at a time when we are wrestling with reforming that system.

We need to stop the totalization agreement and preserve Social Security.

WISHING HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO MARION STOUT ON HER 111TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to wish a happy birthday today to my constituent, Marion Stout. She is 111 today and is now the oldest person in Tennessee.

She never misses a church service at Second Presbyterian Church in Knoxville. She walks two or three times a week with her caregiver, who says she walks until she gets tired, but she never gets tired. For her walks, she always wears a pretty dress, heels and rouge to highlight her blue eyes.

No matter what small thing someone does for her, she always says thank you. She says, I eat right, take care of myself and stay positive.

She bought some GE stock when she was 102 because she wanted a good, long-term investment.

I know the entire House wants to join me in wishing Marion Stout a happy 111th birthday today.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 20, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 116 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 116

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 116 provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 20, the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2007. It may seem strange that we are doing that at this late date.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations. The rule also provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, every Congress has a constitutional responsibility to be good stewards of the money given to it by the American people, but the last Congress failed to live up to this duty. Of the 11 appropriations bills it was supposed to pass in 2006, only two were completed. The others were abandoned, left for the incoming Democratic Congress to deal with.

My fellow Democrats and I could have approached this responsibility in the way it was approached last year, but we promised to run the House differently, to run it responsibly, and that is exactly what we intend to do.

We had a mess to clean up, Mr. Speaker. The budget failures of the past Republican Congress have vastly increased our national debt, but they did more than that. They left agencies, States and localities in limbo for months concerning their future funding. What is more, we have seen an explosion in earmarks over the last 12 years in Washington, earmarks that had greased the wheels of an out-of-control congressional machinery.

The number of earmarks approved by the House had, according to estimates by even the most conservative of groups, doubled and tripled in recent Congresses, and for every shameful, unjustifiable bridge to nowhere that was exposed and shouted down by the public, many more questionable earmarks slipped through undetected, a few lines here or there in a large bill, mispending the people's money and taking advantage of their trust.

The Democrats have pledged to fundamentally reform the way earmarks are passed into law by this body, to bring transparency to a process that until recently had been deliberately shrouded in darkness.

The Rules reform package that we enacted on the first day of this Congress will shed new and much-needed light on the earmarking process. It will require the full disclosure of all earmarks proposed by Members of the House. If a project is worth funding, then the Representative requesting it should have no qualms with standing up publicly on its behalf.

But the earmarks in the budget bills left undone by Republicans last Congress did not have any such standards applied to them, and so Democrats have decided to rid this CR of all earmarks. It was a difficult decision and one which we all had to justify to our constituents back home. But in the end, it was a necessary step to bring forth a new day in the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not perfect, and cleaning up the mess we inherited required difficult choices between bad alternatives.

But I am very pleased that despite it all the legislation does contain increases in funding for critical programs affecting the lives of millions of people at home and around the world.

Spending on veterans health care is increased by \$3.6 billion above the 2006 spending level. Spending on Pell Grants for the first time in 5 years is increased by \$615.4 million. The NIH is going to receive an additional \$619.6 million.

Other increases are going to support public housing, crime and law enforcement, and domestic transportation needs.

The bill even has a global focus, granting an additional \$1.3 million to expand the efforts to combat HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis internationally.

Mr. Speaker, the minority, I predict, will claim that the closed rule under which we are debating this bill is a violation of the spirit of the House and a rejection of the promises Democrats made last year to open up the legislative process.

Let me be very clear, extremely clear about the past record of the House. Since 1997, the House has voted on 75 continuing resolutions, and all of them, 100 percent, were considered under a closed rule process with no amendments allowed. What is more, a third of those continuing resolutions contained substantive policy changes.

In addition to that extensive precedent, the House has already fully debated and considered eight of the appropriations measures contained here. To do so again would take us all year, and we do not have that luxury, not with the many challenges that confront our Nation at this moment in history.

Under the circumstances left for us by the former majority, we have done the best we could. We have produced a bill that will keep the government functioning and a bill that, despite its flaws, is a breath of fresh air compared with how appropriations legislation used to be handled in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are ready for a new direction. They have proved that in this country, and that is why they put a new kind of Congress in power. This Congress is going to be defined not just by the way it does business, but by the kind of business it conducts.

This Congress is not going to pass the buck, leaving unfinished business for others to handle and leaving problems

for others to fix. Democrats are making the tough choices the American people expect us to make and that they elected us to make.

At the end of the day, that is what real leadership is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and the chairwoman of the Rules Committee for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as may I consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee held a 3-hour hearing and took testimony from the appropriations chairman Mr. OBEY and Members that brought forth amendments to the committee in hopes of having them debated and considered on the floor here today.

Many good ideas were presented to the committee. These ideas ranged from considering a true, clean continuing resolution to restoring the lapse Federal Government safety net for 4,400 schools and 780 counties in rural America, from helping farmers with natural disaster relief, to increasing funding for local housing authorities, to taking unspent money from a rain forest education project in Iowa and, instead, spending those moneys to help millions, to help our veterans.

But unfortunately, after listening to the thoughtful testimony from Members on their ideas for improving the bill, the Rules Committee rejected every single one of them and approved this closed rule by an 8-4 vote.

So this House will spend just 1 hour, Mr. Speaker, considering this bill with no amendments even allowed to be debated and no substitute bill allowed to be offered by the minority.

So why the rush and the closed process? We are not asking for much. Give us a few minutes to sort out confusing parts of this resolution that have not passed the House previously, but have magically appeared in this resolution, like a rewriting of the formula for the distribution of section 8 housing funds. This new formula will affect hundreds of communities all across the Nation.

In my district in Washington State, multiple communities are slated to have their grants cut dramatically. In one city, city of Kennewick, the housing authority alone there will have their grant cut by \$1 million. That is roughly one-third of their total budget. This rewritten formula was not approved by the House in previous spending bills for this year and clearly needs more input and discussion before becoming law. Unfortunately, we are denied the opportunity to discuss that.

One major issue that is neglected on this bill is a continuing safety net for our schools and counties in rural areas that have large amounts of Federal land and, therefore, have a very limited tax base. Recognizing the importance of this safety net, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon came to the Rules Committee and offered a bipartisan amendment with

Mr. DEFazio of Oregon that would have provided a 1-year extension of funding so that these schools could keep their libraries open, keep the teachers at least through the end of the school year, and help counties with necessary road repairs. Let me be clear. Last year, over 4,400 schools received \$400 million, and with this bill, they will receive exactly zero.

After convincing testimony by Mr. WALDEN, three Democrat members of the Rules Committee agreed to join me and Chairwoman SLAUGHTER as cosponsors of H.R. 17 which would fix the problem for an additional 7 years. Less than an hour later, however, the Rules Committee voted against even considering a bipartisan amendment that would provide 1 hour of relief for this problem, saying that it is not the right vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, please try to explain to school children when their libraries close because of insufficient funding that the Congress wanted to act but chose not to because they did not feel this was the right vehicle.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of unauthorized programs continue to be funded in this underlying resolution. We do not have a complete list of the unauthorized programs because the underlying measure is not a general appropriations bill and did not go through regular order. Therefore, there is no report which is required to list all unauthorized programs that are funded.

Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak at length about the open process they would have when they were in charge. I want to believe them, I truly do. I have had discussions with my colleagues up in the Rules Committee every time we have met this year, but unfortunately, the actions simply do not match the promises that were made.

□ 1030

At the beginning of the 110th Congress, I heard my colleagues on the majority side say that after we wrap up our first 100 hours agenda, we will have an open process. It has now been nearly 4 weeks. The 100 hours are long past, and yet the House is yet to consider a bill under an open rule. Most have been closed out without any amendments.

I have to ask when, when will this House have the opportunity to debate and consider the bills? When will the minority be permitted to truly participate in this process? Because I can think of no better time than right now when we are considering the funding for our Nation's priorities and funding for almost the entire Federal Government.

Let us have a real debate on the \$463 billion in this omnibus. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Just as a response to my colleague from Washington to remind him that, just a month ago, the minority was the majority. If he thinks the things he points out today were serious problems, he should have fixed them then.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply make a few observations about the gentleman's comments. With respect to the forest funded school program that he is talking about, it needs to be understood that is not within the jurisdiction of our committee. The problem with that program is that the authorizing committee has allowed that program to expire, and it is a mandatory program. Any time the Appropriations Committee tries to involve itself in mandatory programs we get skinned by people on both sides of the aisle, and we are told to mind our own business. We have.

I am very sympathetic about the gentleman's problem, but this is not an appropriated program. The Appropriations Committee deals with discretionary spending, not mandatory spending.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Surely.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the conversation we had earlier that this is not in your jurisdiction, but we were given waivers in this bill for legislation that is also not under your jurisdiction, and the rewrite, if I am not mistaken, of the formula that I mentioned on formula 8.

Mr. OBEY. But the fact is we have not reauthorized expired programs. That is the difference. We do not have the authority to reauthorize a mandatory program. If we did, we would have to find another \$320 million, and I would like to know where that offset is going to come from.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman is right to want this program to continue, but he is wrong if he thinks that the Appropriations Committee is the proper venue for it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I would prefer not to. I only have 5 minutes. The gentleman as the bill manager has more time than I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield for 30 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was offered by our colleague from Oregon, while, yes, it refers to as a mandatory program was simply a 1-year program so that this problem could be fixed.

Mr. OBEY. I understand that. We had nine other requests to do the same thing. If we had done so, Members on your side of the aisle would have come and attacked us and scalped us for doing things that we had no business doing. So he can't have it both ways, which is what many Members in the minority are trying to do today.

I would be happy to join with the gentleman in urging the authorizing committee to fix the problem, but it is not within our purview to do.

With that, I take back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the comments on the rule. Let me simply say that the majority had 8 months to deal with the most basic responsibility of a legislative body, which is to pass the Federal budget. They were in the majority. They now are not. Now they are in the minority.

We are trying to clean up their spilt milk, and they can squawk all they want about how we did it. The fact is, there are no new issues here. Virtually every single issue that will be debated today was already debated when we passed the appropriation bills. These are the bills that the House passed last summer in the previous session of the Congress. We had hundreds of amendments to these bills.

Now because the Republicans in the House couldn't convince the Republicans in the Senate to vote for these bills, we have before us what is, in essence, a pre-conferenced conference report, and we have boiled down this almost 1,000 pages. This is what it would look like if we had an omnibus appropriation bill. We would have had 1,000 pages of legislative material. We have boiled it down to about 150 pages.

We have basically decided to stick with the fiscal year 2006 basic funding level for most programs. We try to then adjust programs for agencies so that they don't have to lay off workers, so that they don't have to have furloughs, such as the Social Security Department and the FBI, who both told us that they desperately needed these adjustments or they would have to shut down their operations or lay off people.

We then decided that there are some priorities on both sides of the aisle, and we used almost \$10 billion, which we had cut from other portions of the bill, to finance those items.

You may not like the choices we have made, but, in contrast to the last Congress which ducked its responsibility to make these choices, at least we have made the choices. At least we have made them, and we are going to vote on this today. We are going to send it to the Senate so that when the President submits his new budget on February 5, he has a clean slate and so do we, and that is the way it ought to be.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER from California.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. We keep hearing that every time this has come before us it has been considered under a closed rule. A closed rule is the norm for this. The fact of the matter is, in 1987 is the last time that we considered a year-long CR that would have allowed for consideration of the entire budget.

Guess what? It was under a Democratic Congress, and at that time they made eight amendments in order. Since that time, we considered short-term continuing resolutions, and they have been done under unanimous consent, they have been done under suspension of the rules. But it is a complete mischaracterization to say every time we consider something like this it has been done under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, at some point, at some point, and I don't know when that will be, the Democratic leadership is going to run out of excuses as to why they deny both Democrats and Republicans, Democrats and Republicans, the opportunity to participate in the process.

First, it was, we promised to get the Six for '06 done in 100 hours. We considered a lot of this stuff in the last Congress. Then it was, well, this is the same rule that was considered back in the 103rd Congress. Now it is, well, this is your mess, Republicans, and we have to clean it up.

The fact of the matter is, the argument that our friends on the other side of the aisle have continued to make over and over and over again is shutting out more than half of the American people. As I say, it is shutting out the opportunity for both Democrats and Republicans to participate in the process.

We offered 21 amendments, very thoughtful amendments, that would have taken \$44.5 million, \$44.5 million, that is utilized right now for rain forest education in Iowa and transfer that spending to help provide desperately needed assistance to the war wounded. These are the kinds of priorities that we have set forward, Mr. Speaker. Tragically, this process has denied us to help the war wounded over those who want to focus attention on rain forest education in Iowa.

Oppose this rule and oppose this measure.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield 1 minute to Mr. OBEY from Wisconsin for whatever he wants to do with it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard unmitigated nonsense from the gentleman. The gentleman is somehow claiming that we are funding that silly rain forest that your party agreed to 2 years ago in Iowa. The fact is that Senator BYRD and I made clear we would provide no earmarks in the 2006 bill.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am not going to yield, so let me finish my thought. The gentleman does it all the time, and it is highly rude.

Mr. DREIER. I always yield.

Mr. OBEY. I would simply point out that we had no requirement to retroactively go back 2 years earlier and repeal silly things that your side of the aisle did 2 years ago. There is not a dollar in this bill for that rain forest. You know it as well as I do. Quit trying to pretend otherwise.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Washington State for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, H.R. 17, of which the chairman of the Rules Committee is a cosponsor.

I went before the Rules Committee yesterday with an amendment cosponsored by my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) to reauthorize, or to appropriate, I should say, not reauthorize, for 1 year, just 1 year, funds for our schools and roads in our communities, \$400 million.

To meet the PAYGO test, we provided a mechanism. It is not the most elegant mechanism out there, but it was an across-the-board reduction in all spending by .00086 percent, or 1 penny out of \$11.59 spent in this bill.

Today, across America, in more than 4,400 school districts in 600 counties, layoff notices are going out for teachers, for sheriffs' deputies, for search-and-rescue patrols, for essential services in our counties. Libraries in Jackson County, Oregon, will close in April, all 15 of them, because the last Congress and now this Congress has failed to take action, failed.

The distinguished gentleman who chairs the Appropriations Committee says, this is mandatory spending; we can't touch it in our bill. You can't authorize in this bill, oh, unless you got a waiver from the Rules Committee, because you cannot stand here and tell me there aren't programs being funded in this bill that have fully been authorized. I don't believe it is the case. This is one such program, and you made the choice not to do it here.

Now, many of you have indicated that you will work with us to fund this somewhere else, and I am deeply appreciative of that. The chairwoman of the Rules Committee, a cosponsor of this reauthorization legislation, made that commitment yesterday, I believe, to work with us on some other vehicle.

But I just have to tell you how dramatic this is in my district and in districts across this country where school board administrators are having to tell their teachers, next year I can't guarantee you will have a contract, and I have to be able to do that by March 1. They are putting out the layoff notices. They are looking at shutting down vital services. All because this

Federal Government made a decision at some point to stop harvesting timber on Federal forest land in a significant measure, an 80 to 85 percent reduction, that this Congress, through its actions in the past and lawsuits and everything else, brought to a dramatic halt, active management of our Federal force.

Last year in America, 9 million acres burned, and this Congress had to appropriate \$1.5 billion to put out forest fires and grassland fires, the most in the history of our country, following another year that was the most.

We will not change the policy so we get commonsense management of our forests. Now, for the first time in nearly 100 years you break the commitment that the Federal Government has had since Teddy Roosevelt was President and created the great forest reserves, to be a good neighbor to the counties where up to 70 or 80 percent of the Federal lands in their counties are owned and managed or mismanaged, in some of our opinions, by the Federal Government.

School kids in my district out in Grant County boarding this bus are going to be traveling on roads where the road department is basically being eliminated.

I want to share with you a letter from a fifth grader in Ashland, Oregon. A fifth grader in Ashland, Oregon, gets it and understands that this Congress ought to be able to understand it and get it. She wrote to me after going to a Martin Luther King event and decided she ought to get involved in public service. Her mother is a school teacher; her father is a professor.

"I live in Ashland and go to Bellview School. I am in fifth grade. I use our library a lot. We always borrow books on tape for car trips. My New Year's resolution is to read all the 'Hank the Cowdog' books, and the library has them all. I need the library to stay open so I can finish my resolution. I also use a lot of books there for school reports.

"Please help to keep our library system open!

"Sincerely, Alice."

I appreciate your willingness to work with us in the future. I wish we could have had the amendment made in order in this resolution so that Alice could get her school books and the layoff notices wouldn't go out.

The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (H.R. 17 a.k.a. County Payments), in both this Congress and the last, has been a strongly bipartisan issue.

The DeFazio-Walden legislation to reauthorize and fund the County Payments program for seven years enjoys the support of 98 Members of their House.

I would like to thank the members of the Rules Committee who heard me out yesterday on a DeFazio-Walden amendment which would have restored funding for this vital program. I would like to thank Congressmen MCGOVERN, ALCEE HASTINGS (FL) and CARDOZA, who following my remarks in Committee, joined Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and

Congressman DOC HASTINGS (WA) as cosponsors of H.R. 17.

As I have said in eight of 18 one-minute Floor speeches, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the County Payments program is a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across America.

The DeFazio-Walden amendment offered in the Rules Committee yesterday would have provided the vital \$400 million to fund this program for one year as we work to fully reauthorize and fund the program. The amendment would have met the PAYGO rule by providing a .00086 percent across-the-board reduction in the [\$463 billion] CR we are considering today. This fraction of a percent reduction amounts to one penny out of every \$11.59 which will be appropriated in this CR.

One penny is all that rural counties and school districts across this country need.

Without this penny, what will happen to rural America's forested counties and school districts? Severe cuts in funding for jail beds, sheriff's patrols, and criminal prosecutions, and the pursuit of meth cooks. Rural school districts will forego overdue repairs, not buy textbooks, or face significant challenges bus-sing kids to school.

Libraries will close in places like Jackson County, Oregon. In fact, during the Rules Committee discussion yesterday, Chairwoman SLAUGHTER commented that "even during the Depression we didn't close libraries." I would like to draw your attention to a letter I received from Alice, a fifth-grader from Ashland, Oregon who utilizes one of the 15 Jackson County libraries scheduled to close in April if this vital funding is not restored.

There are further impacts. Surely you remember the searches for the Kim Family in southern Oregon and the mountain climbers on Mt. Hood? Both Jackson and Hood River Counties used equipment and personnel paid for in part by the County Payments program in those searches. The Klamath County, Oregon sheriff's force of 35 officers will be cut by one-third. They patrol an area 100 times the size of the District of Columbia.

These vital county services and rural school programs were once funded by timber receipts. The virtual elimination of timber harvest in our Federal forests prompted Congress to provide payments to develop forest health improvement projects on public lands and simultaneously stimulate job development and community economic stability.

Consider that Oregon's Second District, which I represent, is 60 percent public land; 78 percent of Harney County is public land; 79 percent of Deschutes County is public land; 72 percent of Hood River County is public land.

While these forest and range lands are America's treasures, these vast tracts of land do not provide a tax base for communities, greatly reducing the amount of revenue that can be generated for services like schools, libraries, and law enforcement.

I appreciate the kind words from the Rules Committee members and their commitment to work with Congressman DEFazio and myself to find the appropriate legislative vehicle to deal with this rural Federal funding crisis.

We must not wait any longer—pink slips are being sent to county employees, rural school programs are being cut, and Alice, the fifth-grader from Ashland, Oregon is losing her library—time is running out.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

□ 1045

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

I understand my colleague from Oregon being frustrated. This is an issue we have discussed over the last year, and I imagine his frustration has doubled because the committee that he was a member of in the last Congress, the bill did not find its way into law because of what happened in the prior Congress. I understand his going with my colleague, Mr. DEFAZIO, to the Rules Committee and flagging the issue because while it is not quite as critical in my direct district, it affects them and it affects my State. And not just Oregon, but there are people in rural America across the United States for whom this is serious.

I am sorry that the last Congress failed in its responsibility. I worked with him then. I will work with him now.

I respectfully disagree slightly in terms of the tactic, in terms of venting frustration at the Rules Committee or the Appropriations Committee. I take the Chair of the Appropriations Committee at his word that he is concerned. He will work with us. The Chair of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, is a cosponsor with us. And I look forward, as we move forward with this year's budget, to doing the best we can.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I think it is the Ways and Means Committee. Is it Agriculture or Ways and Means?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is Natural Resources, isn't it?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think I can clarify it, although I am on the minority side.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the bill, I think, has been referred to both the Natural Resources Committee and the Agriculture Committee. In the last Congress, my subcommittee and the full Resources Committee passed the bill out to the Agriculture Committee, where no further action was taken, nor was there any action taken by the United States Senate, which was no great surprise.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

Mr. DICKS. And if the gentleman will continue to yield, then, of course, under PAYGO, we have to find an offset; isn't that correct?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Right.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to tell the gentleman I want to work with him as well because this is a

major concern in our whole area out there in the Northwest, and I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to divide the issues here. I appreciate my friend and colleague clarifying that it was both committees, neither of which I am a member of, but I am working with him, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DICKS and others in the Northwest to try to resolve this. We are frustrated that the process broke down, but I want us to get started on the right foot.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield again just briefly.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, when we first had the forest plan, the major reduction in timber harvesting, we worked on a bipartisan basis to get an offset. I think it was like \$250 million, something like that, and a phase out over a number of years. But I realize some of the schools, especially in Oregon, get a very substantial amount of money for this program, and I hope we can find an offset.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate Mr. DICKS' willingness to come forward, his interaction with my colleague even now, Mr. WALDEN.

This is important business. It failed last Congress. It is not going to be achieved this Congress unless we are able to do it in a bipartisan fashion, unless we are able to look seriously at dealing with the funding. Wedging it in here, with all due respect, is ill-advised. Having an across-the-board cut for everybody on something where I know Mr. OBEY has been working very hard to clear the decks so we can get busy on this year's budget and that we can start looking at the overall fiscal situation.

I will continue my efforts to work with the gentleman, but I don't think we ought to confuse it today with the matter before us. I think it is appropriate to use as a vehicle to raise the issue. I think it was a point well made before the Rules Committee. I appreciate his coming to the floor here today to talk about unmet needs. There may be others that could talk about unmet needs. The issue before us is moving forward.

For me, I hope this is the last time this CR action happens. I appreciate the Appropriations Committee being willing to make some very tough decisions. This is not something that would have been ideal. I am sure Mr. DICKS, as a senior member of that committee, there are things that he would have done differently. I am sure Mr. OBEY didn't want to be in this situation. But the fact is we are picking up from the abject failure of the Republican leadership last Congress, a breakdown in the process, a failure to pass the legislation, and now we must move forward.

I support this rule. I don't think we have to go back 20 years to find one exception. The fact is we have a plan to move forward. I appreciate the work

that has been done. We don't have to bring up extraneous issues. I, too, like Mr. OBEY, choked hearing about the reference to the rain forest, which wasn't something that is dealt with in this bill. You could go back over time and start undoing the work that Mr. DREIER or others disagree with when they were in the majority. I hope they come to the Appropriations Committee with proposals to rescind things that they did, but do it in the course of regular order in terms of the authorizing committee or coming forward with their own amendments in the course of what is going to happen this year.

To somehow pick on this rule, pick on this CR, trying to deal with the mess that the Appropriations Committee inherited, I think is out of line, uncalled for, and, frankly, hypocritical.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that my friend from Oregon supports regular order. That is not what we are seeing today.

But the pundits say there is no point in talking about the legislative process in this debate today. They say people don't care about the rights of the legislative minority. I am not so sure about that. When people outside the Beltway hear that the funding bill for the rest of the year was basically drawn up by two people—one Senate chairman and one House chairman, in a closed room with no input from anyone else—they might conclude that doesn't sound quite right. And then when they hear this bill cuts military construction by \$730 million below last year's level and falls over \$3 billion short of the redeployment needs of our servicemen and their families, then most people might feel a little more debate and a few more people in the room could have resulted in a solution that fully funded these essential programs. That is the way the legislative process works. Someone drafts up a proposal. Then it is debated and amended, and in the end, a consensus is possible.

But this is the first time in recent memory where the leadership simply puts two people in a room and lets them write an entirely new bill, moving the numbers around to suit their own preferences. And then the House is told "just take it or leave it." No amendments. No give and take. No one else allowed to submit a better idea. And only 30 minutes of debate for the minority side.

Maybe that is why this bill does not meet the critical needs of our soldiers, such as basic housing allowance and research for Gulf War veterans and amputees.

So, Mr. Speaker, process may be considered inside baseball and a nonissue to some. But to me, democracy calls for a fair process, even in a continuing resolution; and, more often than not, it results in a better bill for the average citizen.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to begin by acknowledging the work of Chairman OBEY and his staff in consulting with us on the Labor-HHS chapter of this bill. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has been put in a difficult position. A position we in the House lamented all last year when the other body neglected to schedule time for our bills.

But I would remind everyone that under Chairman LEWIS' leadership, we completed work on every bill but one by July 4 of last year.

This process insist my view is beyond the pale. First of all, this is a continuing resolution in name only. For all practical purposes, it is an omnibus bill. To my knowledge, not one Member of the House other than the bill's sponsor saw this product in its entirety until Monday night. Let us be clear. This is not an inconsequential bill. It provides roughly half the money needed to run the government for an entire, and we are going to whisk it off the House floor in a grand total of 2 hours. The Appropriations Committee has not met to discuss the contents of the bill, let alone to offer amendments that could improve it. And Members of the House have had only slightly more than one day to decode the unorthodox language contained in this 137-page document. Furthermore, the bill before us is not amendable by the body as a whole. I cannot recall the entire time I have been a Member of the House a single appropriations bill that has not been open to amendment at some level.

The American people who watch this debate will see us spend \$463.5 billion of their money with a grand total of 2 hours of discussion, 1 hour on the rule, 1 hour of general debate. If you do the math, that is \$3.8 billion per minute of public debate. Frankly, that is a travesty, and the American people deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Continuing Resolution for Fiscal 2007 and I join in complimenting our distinguished chairman, Mr. OBEY, for accomplishing in a few weeks, with the distinguished Senate Appropriations Chairman, ROBERT BYRD, what their predecessors were both unwilling and unable to do.

A mess was inherited from the prior Congress, and this bill cleans those up and corrects them in a very responsible fashion.

If any of our colleagues on the other side want to criticize this package, I ask why didn't they fix it when they had a chance? I also ask why did they

create this irresponsible problem by delaying passage of these necessary measures in the first place? It should have been done by the end of September of last year. Despite the constitutional expectations to pass all appropriation bills by September 30 in time for the new fiscal year, the last time all appropriation bills passed on time was 1994, when the Democrats were in charge, and thank goodness we are again.

The action today roughly provides cuts in over 60 programs and rescinds unobligated balances in order to transfer \$10 billion in savings that are used to address critical investments such as our veterans' health care and health accounts of the Department of Defense to care for our returning wounded veterans. It will keep our Social Security offices open rather than shutting them down. Community policing is increased by \$70 million. And it provides important help for students, Pell grants, about \$260 more per year for each of them. It covers additional children with disabilities. It provides \$103.7 million for Head Start. It provides funding to expand some of our community health centers to take care of people who don't have any health insurance. It keeps our Public Housing authorities utility costs at least paid for the moment. It provides \$125 million for 38,000 additional students below grade level. And we provide an additional \$197.1 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund. Federal Highway funds are provided at levels guaranteed in SAFETEA and Amtrak funding is maintained at 2006 levels. We know that is still \$266 million below 2004 levels. We just don't have the funds to do everything we want to do. But at least we want to move forward.

Our Nation has many needs, Mr. Speaker, and we need to understand and meet those responsibilities for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. But surely we have responsibilities here at home, and we have a responsibility to meet the need for a defensible budget policy that imposes tough decisions in tough times.

I want to congratulate Mr. OBEY as our new chairman of the Appropriations Committee, somebody who is not only well suited to this position, but probably the finest chairman of Appropriations I have ever had the opportunity to serve with.

Thank you for doing what you had to do for the Nation. Congratulations.

Please, I ask all my colleagues to vote for this continuing resolution on behalf of all the citizens of our country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

□ 1100

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from the State of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this closed rule and to the un-

derlying 137-page, as they call it, omnibus appropriations measure that is being rushed to the floor of the House of Representatives today without committee oversight, regular order, or input from the vast majority of Members of this body.

Last night in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that would have eliminated \$44.5 million in unspent funds from an earmark that dates back to the 2004 omnibus appropriations measure that would have created an indoor rain forest in Coralville, Iowa. Because the project failed to meet its non-Federal matching funds matching requirement, this money remains unspent. It is sitting waiting for it to be spent.

Last night, I offered an amendment that could be used for better purposes. It could be used to make sure that we move the money to the veterans health care program, and that is exactly what my amendment said. Despite their claim of support for veterans health care and their stated opposition to earmarks, Democrats rejected my commonsense proposal on a party line vote of 9-4.

They also rejected along the same party line margin an amendment offered by my colleague from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) which would have replaced the Democrats' omnibus spending bill with a clean continuing resolution that would have saved taxpayers around \$7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the floor today because we believe that the process that should have included more time and more opportunity for feedback but at least the ability in the Rules Committee to do the right thing was rejected by the Democrats who stand up and say that they are for an open and fair process.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my former colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. GINGREY from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this rule and the underlying resolution. No amendments allowed, no committee hearings, no committee votes taken, all we have is simply a closed rule, a closed process, a bunch of broken promises.

So here we go again, Mr. Speaker. Once more, Members of the House find themselves with really no good choices, forced to accept the "our way or the highway" mentality of the new majority, despite their promises to do otherwise.

As if the majority's broken promises for civility and openness in the people's House wasn't disconcerting enough, this continuing resolution is one giant broken promise.

For instance, the Democrats promise no earmarks in this continuing resolution. They even include "window-dressing" language to that effect for the

purpose of their talking points and sound bites. Yet, on closer inspection, one realizes that, while this resolution does eliminate earmarks for organizations such as the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, various law enforcement programs, schools and hospitals, it somehow still provides funding for several notorious million-dollar earmarks such as the Bridge to Nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic rationale for picking at which earmarks stay and which earmarks go strikes me as bizarre and hypocritical, to say the least.

Even more troubling, this continuing resolution shortchanges our military, their families and our communities transitioning under the BRAC process by almost \$3.1 billion, not to mention an additional billion dollar shortfall for military construction. Clearly, the majority has a "tough love" philosophy when it comes to our military, their families and the war on terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, we could have even fixed some of these problems right here, right now if Members had been allowed to offer amendments. But I guess that is not the way it works in this moveon.org Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to also commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. OBEY, for the work that he has done on this bill. I had some reservations, I must say, when we started down this road. But I now realize that Chairman OBEY and our counterpart chairman in the Senate had a good plan to put this thing together.

I regret that last year we did not pass 9 of the 11 appropriations bills. Thank goodness, we passed Defense and Homeland Security. And I do think it is important to point out, and I am sure Mr. OBEY did this, that we passed most of the bills except for HHS in the House.

So I do not blame our colleagues here for what happened. It was the other body that refused to bring the bills up in a timely way.

Now, we have, you know, we had a difficult hand that we were dealt. There is some very good programs like rural water development and some very important school money that we could not include because they were earmarks.

But I do think it is important for everyone to recognize that, for Indian Health Services, we were able to increase that by \$125 million. If we had not done that, hundreds of thousands of members of the tribes would not have been able to get health care.

We were able to take care of the LANDSAT for the U.S. Geological Survey, plus \$16 million; U.S. Forest fire-fighting costs, plus \$70; EPA Homeland Security hazard, plus \$9.5; and operational shortfalls.

One of the biggest problems we have with our land management agencies is that they do not have enough money in the President's budget to cover fixed costs, and 80 to 90 percent of their costs are employees. So when that happens they have been, over the last 7 years, forced to cut employment, not fill vacancies. This has affected the Park Service. This has also affected the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service. They are all hurting. They do not have enough resources. So we have some very major issues that we have to deal with.

Conservation has been hit by this administration. From 2001 to 2006, the Interior budget has been reduced by 1.2 percent in real terms. EPA has been cut by 6.6 percent. We put these two agencies together in this bill.

So this is a question of priority; and what I am hopeful of, with the new majority and with a new budget and with a new allocation, we will be able to stop the bleeding in these conservation agencies. No one has been a bigger supporter of these agencies than the chairman of the committee who has worked with me on a series of conservation initiatives over the years, but this is a serious problem that we have to face up to.

You know, we may have to work to get new legislation enacted in order to increase the amount of money. The land and water conservation money, the amount of money that the administration proposed, has never shown up in the budget. So it is time for us to find some new solutions.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this closed rule and to the bill that comes to the floor under that closed rule. I think it is important to understand that this 137 page bill comes to the floor as a critically important piece of legislation, a piece of legislation that will control the vast amount of spending of the Federal Government for the balance of the fiscal year.

And yet the process by which it is coming to the floor is no less than stunning. The leaders on the other side said, as soon as the 100 hours are over, we will accord you procedural fairness. I have here the Boston Globe and the Washington Post in which each of them said, "As soon as that is done, on January 18," the majority leader said, "Republicans will enjoy more rights and power than they allowed Democrats in the entire 12 years the Democrats were in the minority."

Yet this bill comes to us under a stunning procedure. Indeed, this bill, these 137 pages, at the Appropriations Committee level received no hearing, no hearing whatsoever. At the markup level, no markup occurred.

What does that mean? That means no Democrat was allowed an opportunity

at the committee level to offer an amendment, and no Republican was allowed an opportunity to offer an amendment to this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you are represented by either a Member of the majority or a Member of the minority, you get no say in this bill.

So the bill then proceeded to the Rules Committee. Well, at the Rules Committee, the Democrats and Republicans in theory could offer amendments. Would you like to know how many amendments were made in order for the minority party? Answer: Zero. Not one. Not one.

How about the Democrats? Were they allowed to offer an amendment?

This is not a fair procedure, and this is not democracy.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my only response to some of the comments I have heard from the other side of the aisle is, you are really something else. You are really something else. You spent all of the last year trying to pass appropriation bills. You passed all but one through the House. You could not get your Republican friends in the Senate to support any of them. So when you relinquished your duties we had no domestic budget for the coming year.

I offered on the floor to make any substantive compromises necessary when you were still in control. I offered to make any procedural concessions necessary to enable you to pass the bills on your watch. You did not do it.

Your own chairman at the time admitted that the Republican floor leader in the Senate blocked the bills from passage. So you have forfeited any right to squawk about how we cleaned up your mess.

Now I want to comment on a few claims that have been made. You say there has been no participation by the minority side.

This bill was negotiated at the staff level for 3½ weeks, 7 days a week, around the clock. Your staff was invited to every meeting. Some of them they did not come because they did not like the choices that were being made. But someone had to make the decisions, because you did not.

So the staff negotiated virtually all of those compromises. When they could not reach agreement, then they brought the Members in. You had Senator DOMENICI on the Republican side and Mr. VISCLOSKEY going on and on about the Energy and Water bill, for instance. You had ROSA DELAUNO in the ag bill involved, you had Mr. DICKS in the Interior bill involved as the appropriate subcommittee chairs. If you did not bring your subcommittee ranking members into the mix, that is your fault, not mine.

All I know is, our people participated. If they did not on your side, it is either because they did not want to or because you did not invite them to. I do not know which is which. Do not blame us for your screw-ups.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). All Members are reminded that they should address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule because it is a closed rule that does not provide a fair and open amendment process.

On the positive side, the underlying continuing resolution increases funding for Pell Grants and COPS while not exceeding the spending caps set by the President's budget. As the ranking member on the Higher Education Subcommittee, I am pleased that the Pell Grant maximum awards go up \$260 from \$4,050 to \$4,310.

I also believe in putting more cops on the street through increased funding to the COPS Program, especially since my home town of Orlando saw its murder rate more than double in the past year. I sent a letter to the appropriators signed by Anthony Weiner and 101 Members calling for an increase in COPS funding. I am pleased that this bill increases COPS funding by \$70 million, which is enough money to put 900 new cops on the street.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, you know, last year, I watched the worst budget failure since the 1995 government shutdown led by the Republican Congress. You only passed two appropriations bills, you got no budget resolution passed to get your work done, and then you are sitting here complaining after we are trying to clean up the mess you left behind.

We have a phrase for that in Chicago. It is called chutzpah. You cannot do that. You cannot sit here and come to the floor and complain about what has happened here. Because you handed off nothing but lemons and we are trying to make lemonade out of the lemons that you handed off here.

I compliment us for doing exactly what we said we were going to do. There are no earmarks, there is no pay rise, and there are no gimmicks. It is a new day in Washington from the failures of what happened in the past, and we are very clear that this will be a new day from the type of politics that ran here, and there will be none of that until we pass an increase in the minimum wage. We have done right by what we said.

I compliment, as the Republican speaker beforehand, my colleague, said, from Florida, this is a budget that veterans can be proud of, the education of our children, our health care needs and our law enforcement needs, that directly help people. While college costs have gone up close to 35 percent since 2003, we have held Pell Grants frozen. They are now going up \$260. 53

million more students will get the assistance they need.

Increases for veterans, \$3.6 billion to provide health care for 325,000 veterans.

In the area of the National Institutes of Health Care, 500 research projects will be funded that would not have been funded. This is direct help to the American people.

□ 1115

And in the law enforcement area, 31,000 positions, including 12,000 FBI agents and 2,500 intelligence analysts will be verified, doubling the number of intelligence analysts since 9/11 at the FBI. This is exactly the type of investments we need to do. So from top to bottom, investing in the education, health care, research and law enforcement areas that have been sorriously missed in past budgets, this continuing resolution makes the investments and turns around what were the dire consequences in those areas.

And in addition to that, it makes clear that this is a new day in Washington. We will have no earmarks, no pay raise and no gimmicks. And we are actually turning the page over so we can go forward with the type of budget and the type of appropriations that will continue to put our fiscal house in order, invest in the education and health care and energy and environmental security of this country. This turns the page on a past that was broken and that was failed. And I am proud that we have done that. And I am sure there will be some colleagues, like in the past, that will point to things. But we are pointing in a new direction and turning the page on a broken and failed past and towards a future that, in fact, puts America's priorities and its fiscal house in order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman wouldn't yield. I just wanted to ask one brief question. But I am pleased to yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am curious about this new day for the Democrat Party because in the budget that I have a little more control over or interest in, the Ag Committee, they have cut food stamps by \$11 million. I want to make sure my Republican colleagues understand that. That is right. We just heard from the Democrat leader that it is a new day and the Democrats, on their first day of this new day, have cut food stamps \$11 million.

They have also, in this budget, cut conservation programs right and left. They cut, for example, the Equip Program. The Equip Program is a program designed to help farmers with conservation and watershed and water run off and nutrients going into streams. They cut it by \$70 million.

On the conservation operations account, which is an account that helps farmers create habitat for wildlife,

they cut that by \$72 million. It helps with surface water retention so that we can reduce the impact of drought on farmers. They have cut that, again, \$72 million. It also helps with nutrient management.

There is a small dams program that they cut by \$74.2 million, which affects Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Virginia, Texas, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Oklahoma. And, Mr. Speaker, I am reading out these States so that the Democrat Members from these States can realize that they are, a vote for this bill is a vote to cut their own dams program in their own States by \$74 million.

Now, we have also heard about energy independence. This account also cuts the biomass program in the USDA by \$2 million. But don't think your taxpayers are going to get any of this money. Where does the money go? To the bureaucracy. The FDA, who only asked for a \$20 million increase, gets \$100 million under this omnibus bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply point out to the gentleman who just spoke that our committee took no action whatsoever on all of the items he just mentioned. They are all mandatory programs. All this resolution does is to carry forward the same limitations in those programs that you had in them last year.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address some of the lemonade that the gentleman from Illinois was referring to, the impact on NASA in this omnibus continuing resolution.

The Democratic majority rejected my request to be permitted to offer an amendment addressing some of the devastating cuts to NASA that are included in this bill. The Democrat majority has chosen, I believe, partisanship over partnership. The rhetoric about an open process transparency partnership is nothing but a sham. There is no transparency, there is no openness.

This House passed a NASA budget. We passed \$16.7 billion for NASA. Nearly all of the increased funds in that bill went to fund the replacement of the shuttle. Now, this bill drastically reduces those funds. It will result in delays in producing the vehicle to replace the shuttle, the need to continue the shuttle beyond 2010. In my opinion, these cuts in the NASA budget will lead to billions of dollars of increased funds needed in the outyears to keep the Orion Project on track.

There is only one way to interpret this, my colleagues, and that is to say this is a back-handed way to destroy

the manned space flight program, to destroy the work that is going on in places like Kennedy Space Center, Marshall Space Flight Center, Johnson Space Flight Center.

And to say that there are no earmarks in this bill, in my opinion, is a little bit tongue in cheek. Within this budget is a huge transfer of funds that the administration did not ask for. I don't know what else you can call it other than an earmark.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in response to the chairwoman, we have about four or five speakers left.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

(Mr. HULSHOF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, looking back over this week's legislative accomplishments, I am sure democracy has somehow been furthered by our vote on Monday to congratulate the winners of the Orange Bowl, or our debate yesterday commending the two coaches of the Super Bowl.

But today's vote has some significant consequences in that we are about to do great harm to our Nation's land grant colleges by erasing, zeroing out \$186 million in agricultural research grants. Today's vote has real consequences. There are 24 of you on that side of the political aisle that represent colleges that get this money, and I specifically urge five of you that are first-term Members here, Mrs. BOYDA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. WELCH, to consider the following: Your vote on this continuing resolution zeros out critical research grants in your home districts.

At the University of Missouri-Columbia, my alma mater, this resolution forces 20 faculty reductions, the dismissal of 93 staff and 49 graduate students. You can argue that you open college doors by increasing Pell Grants, and yet those students are going to find the doors of plant and animal science laboratories locked tight.

I urge a "no" vote on this CR.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). All Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. The previous two speakers claimed that there were earmarks in the bill. Now the gentleman is objecting because we eliminated agricultural earmarks. The fact is, those earmarks are very good things. I agree

with the gentleman. But we promised we would eliminate all earmarks in this bill, and that is what we did, and I make no apology for it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, rarely in the history of America has a Congress spent more money with less accountability than this Congress is doing today: \$463 billion with 1, count it, 1 hour of accountability. One hour of general debate. Mr. Speaker, that is \$7.7 billion per minute of the people's money that is being spent here today. Families all across America will spend more time deliberating over the purchase of a new dryer than we will spend in debating how we spend \$463 billion of their hard-earned money.

Now, as the Democrats have taken over, Speaker PELOSI recently said, "Democrats believe we must return to accountability by restoring fiscal discipline and eliminating deficit spending."

This is fiscal discipline? This is accountability?

Mr. Speaker, if this becomes law, everybody's share of the national debt will go up from roughly \$28,860 to \$30,399.

This is cutting out deficit spending? This is accountability? This is fiscal responsibility?

Real fiscal responsibility would have been for the Rules Committee to allow for the amendment from the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) to pass a true CR. That would have saved \$6 billion.

We need to vote this rule down.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering this Democrat joint resolution, which really is nothing more than a big old omnibus bill. It is a bill that uses what appears to be budget gimmicks and what appears to be some misleading rhetoric to mask their true passion, which is spending more of the taxpayer dollars on government programs. And we know government does not have a revenue problem. Government has a spending problem.

And despite their campaign promises, they are refusing to allow the House to discuss and vote on something that they advocated just last month, which would have been a true continuing resolution to restore fiscal responsibility and to pay down the deficit.

Now, as my colleague from Texas said, Representative CAMPBELL offered an amendment, which would have been a true CR. It would have spent \$6.2 billion less. But they didn't want that. They wanted the omnibus. If they were committed to fiscal responsibility, they would join us in that CR. They

would help pass PAUL RYAN's line item veto bill, and they would show what fiscal responsibility looks like. It is another action of the hold-onto-your-wallet Congress.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was before the Rules Committee requesting permission to offer an amendment, and I appreciate the courtesy that was extended to me by the Rules Committee, but would like to highlight, once again, that this omnibus spending bill does not include something that is of high priority to me and a high priority to many of my colleagues on the Republican side, but clearly a priority to Democrats who, last fall, signed a discharge petition attempting to bring to the House floor the issue of disaster assistance for farmers across the country. And despite the fact that 196 Members of the House, Democrat Members of the House, signed a discharge petition, we are still not at the point in which we are able to vote upon providing disaster assistance to farmers across the Midwest and around the country due to weather-related losses.

And I would encourage my colleagues, as we continue to work ourselves through the appropriation process, that we have other opportunities to pursue this. And I hope that the words that were expressed to me yesterday in the Rules Committee that that would be the case remains true.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 30 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 15 seconds remaining.

□ 1130

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to vote "no" on the previous question so I can insert Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. WALDEN's amendment that was rejected in the committee. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the appropriate place the amendment that I will be asking my Members to consider if we defeat the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make certain that everybody understands that the money we are operating under is the money that the Republicans voted last year to spend. We are under their spending levels, not ours, so the complaints ring hollow.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute:
Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

“That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the amendment in section 2 of this resolution if offered by Representative Walden of Oregon or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

“SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows:

Page 39, after line 24, insert the following:
“SEC. 20327. Of the uncosted balances available from funds appropriated under Section 130 of Division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199) under the heading ‘Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Science’, as amended by Section 315 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103), for the Iowa Environmental and Education project in Coralville, Iowa, \$44,569,000 is rescinded.”

Page 87, line 6, strike “\$25,423,250,000” and insert “\$25,467,819,000”.

At the end of chapter 5 of title II of the division B being added by section 2, add the following new section:

“SEC. 20522. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated or made available by this division, \$400,000,000 is appropriated for the purpose of making payments for fiscal year 2007 under sections 102 and 103 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393; 16 U.S.C. 500 note). The Secretary of the Treasury shall use such funds to make such payments in lieu of using funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as otherwise authorized by sections 102(b)(3) and 103(b)(2) of such Act.

“(b) There is hereby rescinded an amount equal to .00086 percent of the budget authority provided (or obligation limit imposed) for fiscal year 2007 for any discretionary account pursuant to this division.”

The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

The Vote on the Previous Question: What It Really Means

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) de-

scribes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's “American Congressional Dictionary”: “If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.”

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

H. Res. 59, by the yeas and nays;
H. Con. Res. 34, by the yeas and nays;
The previous question on H. Res. 116, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of H. Res. 116, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 59.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 59, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Brown-Waite,	Davis, Lincoln
Ackerman	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Aderholt	Buchanan	Deal (GA)
Akin	Burgess	DeFazio
Allen	Burton (IN)	DeGette
Altmire	Butterfield	Delahunt
Andrews	Calvert	DeLauro
Arcuri	Camp (MI)	Dent
Baca	Campbell (CA)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachmann	Cannon	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachus	Cantor	Dicks
Baird	Capito	Dingell
Baker	Capps	Doggett
Baldwin	Capuano	Donnelly
Barrett (SC)	Cardoza	Doolittle
Barrow	Carnahan	Doyle
Bartlett (MD)	Carney	Drake
Barton (TX)	Carson	Dreier
Bean	Carter	Duncan
Becerra	Castle	Edwards
Berkley	Castor	Ehlers
Berman	Chabot	Ellison
Berry	Chandler	Ellsworth
Biggert	Clarke	Emanuel
Bilbray	Clay	Emerson
Billirakis	Cleaver	Engel
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	English (PA)
Bishop (NY)	Coble	Eshoo
Bishop (UT)	Cohen	Etheridge
Blackburn	Cole (OK)	Everett
Blumenauer	Conaway	Fallin
Blunt	Conyers	Fattah
Boehner	Cooper	Feeney
Bonner	Costa	Ferguson
Bono	Costello	Filner
Boozman	Courtney	Flake
Boren	Cramer	Forbes
Boswell	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Boucher	Crowley	Fox
Boustany	Cubin	Frank (MA)
Boyd (FL)	Cuellar	Franks (AZ)
Boyda (KS)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Gallely
Brady (TX)	Davis (AL)	Garrett (NJ)
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Gerlach
Brown (SC)	Davis (IL)	Giffords
Brown, Corrine	Davis (KY)	Gillibrand
	Davis, David	Gillmor

Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Alexander
Buyer
Davis, Jo Ann
Farr
Fossella
Gilchrest

Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sánchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancred o
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wick
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

King (NY)
Maloney (NY)
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Norwood
Oberstar
□ 1156
So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
HONORING THE LIFE OF PERCY LAVON JULIAN
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34.
The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.
This will be a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:
[Roll No. 65]
YEAS—418
Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Beceerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield

Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks

Paul
Reynolds
Rush
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Alexander
Buyer
Davis, Jo Ann
Farr
Fossella
Gilchrest

McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sánchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancred o
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wick
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Hastert
Higgins
King (NY)
Maloney (NY)
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Murphy (CT)
Norwood
Paul
Reynolds

□ 1207

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 20, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 116, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 192, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—227

Abercrombie	Donnelly	Lewis (GA)
Ackerman	Doyle	Lipinski
Allen	Edwards	Loeb sack
Altmire	Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe
Andrews	Ellsworth	Lowe y
Arcuri	Emanuel	Lynch
Baca	Engel	Mahoney (FL)
Baird	Eshoo	Markey
Baldwin	Etheridge	Marshall
Barrow	Fattah	Matheson
Bean	Filner	Matsui
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)
Berkley	Giffords	McCollum (MN)
Berman	Gillibrand	McGovern
Berry	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Bishop (GA)	Gordon	McNerney
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	McNulty
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Meehan
Boren	Grijalva	Meeks (NY)
Boswell	Gutierrez	Melancon
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Michaud
Boyd (FL)	Hare	Millender-
Boyd (KS)	Harman	McDonald
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Braley (IA)	Herse th	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Hill	Mitchell
Butterfield	Hinche y	Mollohan
Capps	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)
Capuano	Hirono	Moore (WI)
Cardoza	Hodes	Moran (VA)
Carnahan	Holden	Murphy (CT)
Carney	Holt	Murphy, Patrick
Carson	Honda	Murtha
Castor	Hoyer	Nadler
Chandler	Inslee	Napolitano
Clarke	Israel	Neal (MA)
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Clyburn	(TX)	Olver
Cohen	Jefferson	Ortiz
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell
Costa	Jones (OH)	Pastor
Costello	Kagen	Payne
Courtney	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Cramer	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kennedy	Peterson (MN)
Cuellar	Kildee	Pomeroy
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Davis (AL)	Kind	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Reyes
Davis, Lincoln	Lampson	Rodriguez
DeGette	Langevin	Ross
Delahunt	Lantos	Rothman
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Lee	Rush
Doggett	Levin	Ryan (OH)

Salazar	Slaughter	Van Hollen
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
T.	Snyder	Visclosky
Sanchez, Loretta	Solis	Walz (MN)
Sarbanes	Space	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Spratt	Schultz
Schiff	Stark	Waters
Schwartz	Stupak	Watson
Scott (GA)	Sutton	Watt
Scott (VA)	Tanner	Waxman
Serrano	Tauscher	Weiner
Sestak	Taylor	Welch (VT)
Shea-Porter	Thompson (CA)	Wexler
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (OH)
Shuler	Tierney	Woolsey
Simpson	Towns	Wu
Sires	Udall (CO)	Wynn
Skelton	Udall (NM)	Yarmuth

NAYS—192

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Myrick
Akin	Gallegly	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Bachus	Gerlach	Pearce
Baker	Gillmor	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Petri
Barton (TX)	Goode	Pickering
Bigert	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bilbray	Granger	Platts
Bilirakis	Graves	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Porter
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Blunt	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Heller	Putnam
Bonner	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bono	Herger	Ramstad
Boozman	Hoekstra	Regula
Boustany	Hooley	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Renzi
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Camp (MI)	Jordan	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	King (IA)	Sali
Cantor	Kingston	Saxton
Capito	Kirk	Schmidt
Carter	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Knollenberg	Sessions
Chabot	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Coble	LaHood	Shays
Cole (OK)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Conaway	Latham	Shuster
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Smith (NE)
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	Linder	Souder
Davis, David	LoBiondo	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Lucas	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Tancred o
DeFazio	E.	Terry
Dent	Mack	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Tiberi
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Dreier	McCotter	Walberg
Duncan	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Ehlers	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McMorris	Weller
Fallin	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Feeney	Mica	Whitfield
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Flake	Miller (MI)	Wilson (NM)
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Wolf
Fox	Murphy, Tim	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Alexander	Hastert	Meek (FL)
Buyer	Higgins	Norwood
Davis, Jo Ann	Hobson	Paul
Farr	King (NY)	Reynolds
Fossella	Maloney (NY)	
Gilchrest	McDermott	

□ 1216

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 191, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

AYES—225

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Olver
Ackerman	Hall (NY)	Ortiz
Allen	Hare	Pallone
Altmire	Harman	Pascrell
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Arcuri	Herse th	Payne
Baca	Hill	Pelosi
Baird	Hinche y	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Peterson (MN)
Barrow	Hirono	Pomeroy
Bean	Hodes	Price (NC)
Becerra	Holden	Rahall
Berkley	Holt	Rangel
Berman	Honda	Reyes
Berry	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Bishop (GA)	Inslee	Ross
Bishop (NY)	Israel	Rothman
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Boren	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Boswell	(TX)	Rush
Boucher	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Boyd (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Boyda (KS)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	T.
Braley (IA)	Kagen	Sanchez, Loretta
Brown, Corrine	Kanjorski	Sarbanes
Butterfield	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Capps	Kennedy	Schiff
Capuano	Kildee	Schwartz
Cardoza	Kilpatrick	Scott (GA)
Carnahan	Kind	Scott (VA)
Carney	Klein (FL)	Serrano
Carson	Kucinich	Sestak
Castor	Lampson	Shea-Porter
Chandler	Langevin	Sherman
Clarke	Lantos	Shuler
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Simpson
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Sires
Clyburn	Lee	Skelton
Cohen	Levin	Slaughter
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Lipinski
Cooper	Smith (WA)	Snyder
Costa	Loeb sack	Solis
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Space
Courtney	Lowe y	Spratt
Cramer	Lynch	Stark
Crowley	Mahoney (FL)	Stupak
Cuellar	Markey	Sutton
Cummings	Marshall	Tanner
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Taylor
Davis, Lincoln	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	McGovern	Tierney
DeLauro	McIntyre	Towns
Dicks	McNerney	Udall (CO)
Dingell	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Doggett	Meehan	Van Hollen
	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
	Michaud	Visclosky
	Millender-	Walz (MN)
	McDonald	Wasserman
	Miller (NC)	Schultz
	Miller, George	Waters
	Mitchell	Watson
	Mollohan	Watt
	Moore (KS)	Waxman
	Moore (WI)	Weiner
	Moran (VA)	Welch (VT)
	Murphy (CT)	Wexler
	Murphy, Patrick	Wilson (OH)
	Murtha	Woolsey
	Nadler	Wu
	Napolitano	Wynn
	Neal (MA)	Yarmuth
	Oberstar	
	Obey	

NOES—191

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Myrick
Akin	Galleghy	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Bachus	Gerlach	Pearce
Baker	Gillmor	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Petri
Barton (TX)	Goode	Pitts
Biggert	Goodlatte	Platts
Blibray	Granger	Poe
Bilirakis	Graves	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hayes	Putnam
Boehner	Heller	Radanovich
Bonner	Hensarling	Ramstad
Bono	Herger	Regula
Boozman	Hobson	Rehberg
Boustany	Hoekstra	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hoolley	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Sali
Cannon	Keller	Saxton
Cantor	King (IA)	Schmidt
Capito	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Kirk	Sessions
Castle	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Chabot	Knollenberg	Shaays
Coble	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Cole (OK)	LaHood	Shuster
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Cubin	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Davis, David	Linder	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Terry
DeFazio	Lungren, Daniel	Thornberry
Dent	E.	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Turner
Doolittle	Marchant	Upton
Drake	McCarthy (CA)	Walberg
Dreier	McCaul (TX)	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McCotter	Walsh (NY)
Ehlers	McCrery	Wamp
Emerson	McHenry	Weldon (FL)
English (PA)	McKeon	Weller
Everett	McMorris	Westmoreland
Fallin	Rodgers	Whitfield
Feeney	Mica	Wicker
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)
Foxo	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	

NOT VOTING—19

Alexander	Hastert	Melancon
Buyer	Higgins	Norwood
Davis (AL)	King (NY)	Paul
Davis, Jo Ann	Maloney (NY)	Pickering
Farr	McDermott	Reynolds
Fossella	McHugh	
Gilchrest	Meek (FL)	

□ 1225

Mr. BAKER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS AS CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS ON TRADE POLICY AND NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 161(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2211), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair

announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations:

Mr. RANGEL, New York
Mr. LEVIN, Michigan
Mr. TANNER, Tennessee
Mr. MCCRERY, Louisiana
Mr. HERGER, California

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 17, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, I am forwarding to you the Committee's recommendations for certain positions for the 110th Congress.

First, pursuant to Section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Committee designated the following Members to serve on the Joint Committee on Taxation: Mr. Rangel, Mr. Stark, Mr. Levin, Mr. McCrery, Mr. Herger.

Second, pursuant to Section 161 of the Trade Act of 1974, the Committee recommended the following Members to serve as official advisors for international conference meetings and negotiating sessions on trade agreements: Mr. Rangel, Mr. Levin, Mr. Tanner, Mr. McCrery, Mr. Herger.

Third, pursuant to House Rule X, Clause 5 (2)(A)(i), the Committee designated the following Members to serve on the Committee on the Budget: Mr. Becerra, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Tiberi, Mr. Porter.

Best regards,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 116, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 20

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007".

SEC. 2. The Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, division B), as amended by Public Laws 109-369 and 109-383, is amended to read as follows:

"DIVISION B—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2007

"The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational

units of Government for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes, namely:

"TITLE I—FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at the level specified in subsection (c) and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006, for projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise provided for and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

"(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(2) The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(3) The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(4) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(5) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(6) The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(7) The Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(8) The Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(9) The Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.

"(b) For purposes of this division, the term 'level' means an amount.

"(c) The level referred to in subsection (a) shall be the amounts appropriated in the appropriations Acts referred to in such subsection, including transfers and obligation limitations, except that—

"(1) such level shall not include any amount designated as an emergency requirement, or to be for overseas contingency operations, pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006; and

"(2) such level shall be calculated without regard to any rescission or cancellation of funds or contract authority, other than—

"(A) the 1 percent government-wide rescission made by section 3801 of division B of Public Law 109-148;

"(B) the 0.476 percent across-the-board rescission made by section 439 of Public Law 109-54, relating to the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies; and

"(C) the 0.28 percent across-the-board rescission made by section 638 of Public Law 109-108, relating to Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies.

"SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

"SEC. 103. Appropriations provided by this division that, in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006, carried a multiple-year or no-year period of availability shall retain a comparable period of availability.

"SEC. 104. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this division, the requirements, authorities, conditions, limitations, and other provisions of the appropriations Acts referred to in section 101(a) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106.

"SEC. 105. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to

section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were specifically prohibited during fiscal year 2006.

“SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this division or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this division shall be available through September 30, 2007.

“SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this division prior to the enactment of the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization provided by this division (or the applicable regular appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007) as in effect following such enactment.

“SEC. 108. Funds appropriated by this division may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

“SEC. 109. With respect to any discretionary account for which advance appropriations were provided for fiscal year 2007 or 2008 in an appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006, the levels established by section 101 shall include advance appropriations in the same amount for fiscal year 2008 or 2009, respectively, with a comparable period of availability.

“SEC. 110. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2006, and for activities under the Food Stamp Act of 1977, the levels established by section 101 shall be the amounts necessary to maintain program levels under current law.

“(b) In addition to the amounts otherwise provided by section 101, the following amounts shall be available for the following accounts for advance payments for the first quarter of fiscal year 2008:

“(1) ‘Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners’, for benefit payments under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, \$68,000,000, to remain available until expended.

“(2) ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Grants to States for Medicaid’, for payments to States or in the case of section 1928 on behalf of States under title XIX of the Social Security Act, \$65,257,617,000, to remain available until expended.

“(3) ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs’, for payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$1,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

“(4) ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for Foster Care and Adoption Assistance’, for payments to States or other non-Federal entities under title IV-E of the Social Security Act, \$1,810,000,000.

“(5) ‘Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income Program’, for benefit payments under title XVI of the Social Security Act, \$16,810,000,000, to remain available until expended.

“SEC. 111. (a)(1) In addition to any amounts otherwise provided by this division, such

sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated to fund, for covered employees under a statutory pay system (as defined by section 5302 of title 5, United States Code), 50 percent of any increase in rates of pay which became effective under sections 5303 through 5304a of such title 5 in January 2007.

“(2)(A) In addition to any amounts otherwise provided by this division, such sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated to provide the amount which would be necessary to fund, for covered employees not described in paragraph (1), 50 percent of the cost of an increase in rates of pay, calculated as if such employees were covered by paragraph (1) and as if such increase had been made on the first day of the first pay period beginning in January 2007 based on the rates that were in effect for such employees as of the day before such first day.

“(B) Subparagraph (A) is intended only to provide funding for pay increases for covered employees not described in paragraph (1). Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be considered to modify, supersede, or render inapplicable the provisions of law in accordance with which the size or timing of any pay increase actually provided with respect to such employees is determined.

“(b) Appropriations under this section shall include funding for pay periods beginning on or after January 1, 2007, and the pay costs covered by this appropriation shall include 50 percent of the increases in agency contributions for employee benefits resulting from the pay increases described in subsection (a).

“(c) For purposes of this section, the term ‘covered employees’ means employees whose pay is funded in whole or in part (including on a reimbursable basis) by any account for which funds are provided by this division (other than by chapters 2 and 11 of title II of this division) after October 4, 2006.

“SEC. 112. Any language specifying an earmark in a committee report or statement of managers accompanying an appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006 shall have no legal effect with respect to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 113. Within 30 days of the enactment of this section, each of the following departments and agencies shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spending, expenditure, or operating plan for fiscal year 2007 at a level of detail below the account level:

“(1) Department of Agriculture.

“(2) Department of Commerce, including the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

“(3) Department of Defense, with respect to military construction, family housing, the Department of Defense Base Closure accounts, and ‘Defense Health Program’.

“(4) Department of Education.

“(5) Department of Energy.

“(6) Department of Health and Human Services.

“(7) Department of Housing and Urban Development.

“(8) Department of the Interior.

“(9) Department of Justice.

“(10) Department of Labor.

“(11) Department of State and United States Agency for International Development.

“(12) Department of Transportation.

“(13) Department of the Treasury.

“(14) Department of Veterans Affairs, including ‘Construction, Major Projects’.

“(15) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

“(16) National Science Foundation.

“(17) The Judiciary.

“(18) Office of National Drug Control Policy.

“(19) General Services Administration.

“(20) Office of Personnel Management.

“(21) National Archives and Records Administration.

“(22) Environmental Protection Agency.

“(23) Indian Health Service.

“(24) Smithsonian Institution.

“(25) Social Security Administration.

“(26) Corporation for National and Community Service.

“(27) Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

“(28) Food and Drug Administration.

“SEC. 114. Within 15 days after the enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate—

“(1) a report specifying, by account, the amounts provided by this division for executive branch departments and agencies; and

“(2) a report specifying, by account, the amounts provided by section 111 for executive branch departments and agencies.

“SEC. 115. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division and notwithstanding section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31), the percentage adjustment scheduled to take effect under such section for 2007 shall not take effect.

“TITLE II—ELIMINATION OF EARMARKS, ADJUSTMENTS IN FUNDING, AND OTHER PROVISIONS

“CHAPTER 1—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

“SEC. 20101. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for Agricultural Programs of the Department of Agriculture shall be as follows: ‘Common Computing Environment’, \$107,971,000; ‘Economic Research Service’, \$74,825,000; ‘National Agricultural Statistics Service’, \$146,543,000, of which up to \$36,074,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture; ‘Agricultural Research Service, Buildings and Facilities’, \$0; ‘Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Research and Education Activities’, \$671,224,000; ‘Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Extension Activities’, \$450,252,000; ‘Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Salaries and Expenses’, \$841,970,000; ‘Agricultural Marketing Service, Payments to States and Possessions’, \$1,334,000; ‘Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Salaries and Expenses’, \$37,564,000; ‘Food Safety and Inspection Service’, \$886,982,000; and ‘Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses’, \$1,028,700,000.

“SEC. 20102. The amounts included under the heading ‘Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Research and Education Activities’ in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-97) shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting ‘\$322,597,000’ for ‘\$178,757,000’; by substituting ‘\$30,008,000’ for ‘\$22,230,000’; by substituting ‘for payments to eligible institutions (7 U.S.C. 3222), \$40,680,000’ for ‘for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University (7 U.S.C. 3222), \$37,591,000’; by substituting ‘\$0’ for ‘\$128,223,000’; by substituting ‘competitive grants for agricultural research on improved pest control’ for ‘special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control’; by substituting ‘\$190,229,000’ for ‘\$183,000,000’; by substituting ‘\$1,544,000’ for ‘\$1,039,000’; by substituting ‘competitive grants for the purpose of carrying out all provisions of 7 U.S.C. 3242’ for ‘noncompetitive grants for the purpose of carrying out all provisions of 7 U.S.C.

3242'; by substituting 'to institutions eligible to receive funds under 7 U.S.C. 3221 and 3222, \$12,375,000' for 'to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328), including Tuskegee and West Virginia State University, \$12,312,000'; by substituting '\$3,342,000' for '\$2,250,000'; by substituting '\$10,083,000' for '\$50,471,000'; by substituting '\$2,561,000' for '\$2,587,000'; and by substituting '\$2,030,000' for '\$2,051,000'.

"SEC. 20103. The amounts included under the heading 'Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Extension Activities' in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division as follows: by substituting '\$285,565,000' for '\$275,730,000'; by substituting '\$3,321,000' for '\$3,273,000'; by substituting '\$63,538,000' for '\$62,634,000'; by substituting 'at institutions eligible to receive funds under 7 U.S.C. 3221 and 3222, \$16,777,000' for 'at the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95-113 (7 U.S.C. 3222b), \$16,777,000'; by substituting '\$3,000,000' for '\$1,196,000'; by substituting 'payments for cooperative extension work by eligible institutions (7 U.S.C. 3221), \$35,205,000' for 'payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328) and Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, \$33,868,000'; and by substituting '\$6,922,000' for '\$25,390,000'.

"SEC. 20104. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for Conservation Programs of the Department of Agriculture shall be as follows: 'Natural Resources Conservation Service, Conservation Operations', \$759,124,000; and 'Natural Resources Conservation Service, Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations', \$0.

"SEC. 20105. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for Rural Development Programs of the Department of Agriculture shall be as follows: 'Rural Development Salaries and Expenses', \$160,349,000; 'Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Rural Cooperative Development Grants', \$26,718,000; and 'Rural Utilities Service, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account', \$0.

"SEC. 20106. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Rural Housing Service, Rental Assistance Program' shall be \$616,020,000, to remain available through September 30, 2008, and the second and third provisos under such heading shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division. Using funds available in such account, the Secretary of Agriculture may enter into or renew contracts under section 521(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490a(a)(2)) for two years. Any unexpended balances remaining at the end of such two-year agreements may be transferred and used for the purposes of any debt reduction; maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation of any existing projects; preservation; and rental assistance activities authorized under title V of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.).

"SEC. 20107. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Food and Nutrition Service, Child Nutrition Programs' shall be \$13,345,487,000, of which \$7,614,414,000 is appropriated funds and \$5,731,073,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c).

"SEC. 20108. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for Foreign Assistance and Related Programs of the Department of Agriculture shall be as follows: 'Foreign Agricultural

Service, Salaries and Expenses', \$155,422,000; 'Foreign Agricultural Service, Public Law 480 Title I Ocean Freight Differential Grants', \$0; and 'Foreign Agricultural Service, Public Law 480 Title II Grants', \$1,214,711,000.

"SEC. 20109. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Food and Drug Administration, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$1,965,207,000, of which \$352,200,000 shall be derived from prescription drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379h, shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended, and shall not include any fees pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379h(a)(2) and (a)(3) assessed for fiscal year 2008 but collected in fiscal year 2007, \$43,726,000 shall be derived from medical device user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended, and \$11,604,000 shall be derived from animal drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That fees derived from prescription drug, medical device, and animal drug assessments received during fiscal year 2007, including any such fees assessed prior to the current fiscal year but credited during the current year, shall be subject to the fiscal year 2007 limitation: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated: (1) \$453,180,000 shall be for the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (2) \$567,594,000 shall be for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs, of which not less than \$34,900,000 shall be for the Office of Generic Drugs; (3) \$209,180,000 shall be for the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (4) \$103,544,000 shall be for the Center for Veterinary Medicine and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (5) \$253,710,000 shall be for the Center for Devices and Radiological Health and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (6) \$41,751,000 shall be for the National Center for Toxicological Research; (7) \$68,609,000 shall be for Rent and Related activities, of which \$25,552,000 is for relocation expenses, other than the amounts paid to the General Services Administration for rent; (8) \$146,013,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent; and (9) \$121,626,000 shall be for other activities, including the Office of the Commissioner, the Office of Management, the Office of External Relations, the Office of Policy and Planning, and central services for these offices.

"SEC. 20110. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Food and Drug Administration, Buildings and Facilities' shall be \$4,950,000.

"SEC. 20111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions included in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: the last proviso under the heading 'Common Computing Environment'; the provisos under the heading 'Economic Research Service'; the third, fourth, sixth, and eighth through twelfth provisos under the heading 'Agricultural Research Service, Salaries and Expenses'; the set-aside of funds under the heading 'Agricultural Marketing Service, Payments to States and Possessions'; the set-aside of \$753,252,000 under the heading 'Food Safety and Inspection Service' and the first three provisos under such heading; the first proviso under the heading 'Natural Resources

Conservation Service, Resource Conservation and Development'; the set-aside of \$5,600,000 in the seventh proviso under the heading 'Rural Development Programs, Rural Community Advancement Program'; the first proviso under the heading 'Rural Development Salaries and Expenses'; the second proviso in the second paragraph under the heading 'Rural Housing Service, Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account'; the last paragraph under the heading 'Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account'; the set-aside of \$2,500,000 under the heading 'Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Rural Cooperative Development Grants'; the proviso under the heading 'Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Rural Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities Grants'; the last paragraph under the heading 'Rural Utilities Service, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account'; the second proviso under the heading 'Food and Nutrition Service, Food Stamp Program'; the first paragraph, including the proviso in such paragraph, under the heading 'Foreign Agricultural Service, Public Law 480 Title I Direct Credit and Food for Progress Program Account'; and the first four provisos under the heading 'Food and Drug Administration, Salaries and Expenses'.

"SEC. 20112. The following provisions of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting '2007' and '2008' for '2006' and '2007', respectively, each place they appear: the second paragraph under the heading 'Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Salaries and Expenses'; the availability of funds clause under the heading 'Natural Resources Conservation Service, Conservation Operations'; the eighth proviso under the heading 'Rural Development Programs, Rural Community Advancement Program'; the first proviso in the second paragraph under the heading 'Rural Housing Service, Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account'; the proviso under the heading 'Rural Housing Service, Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants'; the fourth proviso under the heading 'Rural Housing Service, Rural Housing Assistance Grants'; the three availability of funds clauses under the heading 'Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account'; the second proviso under the heading 'Food and Nutrition Service, Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)'; section 719; section 734; and section 738.

"SEC. 20113. Section 704 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall be applied to the funds appropriated by this division by substituting 'avian influenza programs' for 'low pathogen avian influenza program'.

"SEC. 20114. The following sections of title VII of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting \$0 for the following dollar amounts: section 721, \$2,500,000; section 723, \$1,250,000; section 755, \$1,000,000; section 764, \$650,000; section 766, \$200,000; section 767, \$2,250,000; section 779, \$6,000,000; section 790, \$140,000, \$400,000, \$200,000, \$500,000, and \$350,000; and section 791, \$1,000,000.

"SEC. 20115. The following sections of title VII of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply for fiscal year 2007: section 726; paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 754; section 768; section 785; and section 789.

"SEC. 20116. The following sections of title VII of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 authorized or required certain actions by the Secretary of Agriculture that have been performed before the date of the enactment of this division and need not reoccur: section 761; section 770; section 782; and section 783.

"SEC. 20117. Of the unobligated balances under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), \$37,601,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20118. Of the unobligated balances of funds provided pursuant to section 16(h)(1)(A) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(1)(A)), \$11,200,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20119. Of the funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c), \$74,000,000 shall not be obligated and \$74,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20120. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated or made available by this division, \$31,000,000 is appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture for the costs of loan and loan guarantee programs under the Rural Development Mission Area to ensure that the fiscal year 2006 program levels for such loan and loan guarantee programs are maintained for fiscal year 2007. The Secretary may transfer funds, to the extent practicable, among loan and loan guarantee programs within the Rural Development Mission Area to ensure that the fiscal year 2006 program levels for such programs and activities are maintained during fiscal year 2007.

"SEC. 20121. For the programs and activities administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Farm Service Agency, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, the Secretary may transfer funds made available by this division among programs and activities within such Fund: *Provided*, That the fiscal year 2006 program levels for such programs and activities are at least maintained.

"SEC. 20122. With respect to any loan or loan guarantee program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture that has a negative credit subsidy score for fiscal year 2007, the program level for the loan or loan guarantee program, for the purposes of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, shall be the program level established pursuant to such Act for fiscal year 2006.

"SEC. 20123. The Secretary of Agriculture shall continue the Water and Waste Systems Direct Loan Program and the loan guarantee programs of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund under the authority and conditions (including the borrower's interest rate and fees as of September 1, 2006) provided by the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.

"SEC. 20124. Of the appropriations available for payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d)), if the payment allocation pursuant to section 1425(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3175(c)) would be less than \$100,000 for any institution eligible under section 3(d)(2) of the Smith-Lever Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall adjust payment allocations under section 1425(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to ensure that each institution receives a payment of not less than \$100,000.

"CHAPTER 2—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 20201. For purposes of title I, the appropriations Acts listed in section 101(a) shall be deemed to include the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006 for purposes of activities of the Department of De-

fense under the 'Environmental Restoration' accounts.

"SEC. 20202. In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this division or any other Act, amounts are appropriated for certain military activities of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, as follows:

"(1) For an additional amount for 'Military Personnel, Army', \$3,902,556,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Army on active duty.

"(2) For an additional amount for 'Military Personnel, Navy', \$3,726,778,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Navy on active duty.

"(3) For an additional amount for 'Military Personnel, Marine Corps', \$1,241,965,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Marine Corps on active duty.

"(4) For an additional amount for 'Military Personnel, Air Force', \$3,278,835,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Air Force on active duty.

"(5) For an additional amount for 'Reserve Personnel, Army', \$321,642,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Army Reserve on active duty.

"(6) For an additional amount for 'Reserve Personnel, Navy', \$204,115,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Navy Reserve on active duty.

"(7) For an additional amount for 'Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps', \$43,082,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty.

"(8) For an additional amount for 'Reserve Personnel, Air Force', \$76,218,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Air Force Reserve on active duty.

"(9) For an additional amount for 'National Guard Personnel, Army', \$457,226,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Army National Guard on active duty.

"(10) For an additional amount for 'National Guard Personnel, Air Force', \$258,000,000, to be available for the basic allowance for housing for members of the Air National Guard on active duty.

"(11) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Army', \$1,810,774,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(12) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Navy', \$1,202,313,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(13) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps', \$473,141,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(14) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Air Force', \$1,684,019,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(15) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide', \$86,386,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(16) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve', \$202,326,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(17) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve', \$52,136,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(18) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve', \$10,004,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(19) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve', \$53,850,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(20) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard', \$387,579,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"(21) For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard', \$177,993,000, to be available for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization.

"SEC. 20203. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this division, amounts are appropriated for the Defense Health Program of the Department of Defense, as follows:

"(1) For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law, \$21,217,000,000, of which \$20,494,000,000 shall be for Operation and Maintenance, of which not to exceed 2 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2008, and of which up to \$10,887,784,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which \$375,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2009, shall be for Procurement; and of which \$348,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2008, shall be for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.

"(2) Of the amount made available in this section for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, \$217,500,000 shall be made available only for peer reviewed cancer research activities, of which \$127,500,000 shall be for breast cancer research activities; of which \$10,000,000 shall be for ovarian cancer research activities; and of which \$80,000,000 shall be for prostate cancer research activities.

"(3) Amounts made available in this section are subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109-289).

"CHAPTER 3—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 20301. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: 'Corps of Engineers, Construction', \$2,334,440,000; and 'Corps of Engineers, General Expenses', \$166,300,000.

"SEC. 20302. The limitation concerning total project costs in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended (33 U.S.C. 2280), shall not apply during fiscal year 2007 to any project that received funds provided in this division.

"SEC. 20303. All of the provisos under the heading 'Corps of Engineers—Civil, Department of Army, Investigations' in Public Law 109-103 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20304. All of the provisos under the heading 'Corps of Engineers—Civil, Department of Army, Construction' in Public Law 109-103 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20305. All of the provisos under the heading 'Corps of Engineers—Civil, Department of Army, Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee' in Public Law 109-103 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20306. All of the provisos under the heading 'Corps of Engineers—Civil, Department of Army, Operation and Maintenance' in Public Law 109-103 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20307. The last proviso under the heading 'Corps of Engineers—Civil, Department of Army, General Expenses' in Public

Law 109-103 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20308. Section 135 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20309. The last proviso under the heading ‘Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources’ in Public Law 109-103 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20310. The last proviso under the heading ‘Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, California Bay-Delta Restoration’ in Public Law 109-103 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20311. Section 208 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20312. Section 8 of the Water Desalination Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 10301 note) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a) by striking ‘2006’ and inserting ‘2011’; and

“(2) in subsection (b) by striking ‘2006’ and inserting ‘2011’.

“SEC. 20313. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ‘Department of Energy, Elk Hills School Lands Fund’, \$0; ‘Department of Energy, Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve’, \$5,000,000; ‘Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration’, \$90,314,000; ‘Department of Energy, Science’, \$3,796,393,000; ‘Department of Energy, Nuclear Waste Disposal’, \$99,000,000; ‘Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, Weapons Activities’, \$6,275,103,000; and ‘Department of Energy, Defense Environmental Cleanup’, \$5,730,448,000.

“SEC. 20314. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Energy, Energy Supply and Conservation’ shall be \$2,153,627,000, of which not less than \$1,473,844,000 shall be for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Resources.

“SEC. 20315. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$35,000, shall be \$275,789,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$43,075,000 shall be available for cyber-security activities and of which \$7,000,000 shall be available for necessary administrative expenses of the loan guarantee program authorized in title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$123,000,000 in fiscal year 2007 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during 2007, and any related appropriated receipt account balances remaining from prior years’ miscellaneous revenues, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$152,789,000.

“SEC. 20316. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Energy, Na-

tional Nuclear Security Administration, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation’ shall be \$1,683,339,000, of which \$472,730,000 shall be for International Nuclear Material Protection and Cooperation and of which \$115,495,000 shall be for Global Threat Reduction Initiative.

“SEC. 20317. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for necessary expenses of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including official representation expenses (not to exceed \$15,000), and including purchase of promotional items for use in the recruitment of individuals for employment, shall be \$813,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, \$45,700,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$659,055,000 in fiscal year 2007 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2007 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation estimated at not more than \$154,245,000.

“SEC. 20318. The Secretary of Energy may not make available any of the funds provided by this division or previous appropriations Acts for construction activities for Project 99-D-143, mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River Site, South Carolina, until August 1, 2007.

“SEC. 20319. Section 302 of Public Law 102-377 is repealed.

“SEC. 20320. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, subject to the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, as amended, commitments to guarantee loans under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 shall not exceed a total principal amount, any part of which is to be guaranteed, of \$4,000,000,000: *Provided*, That there are appropriated for the cost of the guaranteed loans such sums as are hereafter derived from amounts received from borrowers pursuant to section 1702(b)(2) of that Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the source of payments received from borrowers for the subsidy cost shall not be a loan or other debt obligation that is made or guaranteed by the Federal government. In addition, fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) in fiscal year 2007 shall be credited as offsetting collections to the Departmental Administration account for administrative expenses of the Loan Guarantee Program: *Provided further*, That the sum appropriated for administrative expenses for the Loan Guarantee Program shall be reduced by the amount of fees received during fiscal year 2007: *Provided further*, That any fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the amount appropriated for administrative expenses shall not be available until appropriated.

“(b) No loan guarantees may be awarded under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 until final regulations are issued that include—

“(1) programmatic, technical, and financial factors the Secretary will use to select projects for loan guarantees;

“(2) policies and procedures for selecting and monitoring lenders and loan performance; and

“(3) any other policies, procedures, or information necessary to implement title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

“(c) The Secretary of Energy shall enter into an arrangement with an independent auditor for annual evaluations of the pro-

gram under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. In addition to the independent audit, the Comptroller General shall conduct an annual review of the Department’s execution of the program under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The results of the independent audit and the Comptroller General’s review shall be provided directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

“(d) The Secretary of Energy shall promulgate final regulations for loan guarantees under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 within 6 months of enactment of this division.

“(e) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this division, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing a summary of all activities under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, beginning in fiscal year 2007, with a listing of responses to loan guarantee solicitations under such title, describing the technologies, amount of loan guarantee sought, and the applicants’ assessment of risk.

“SEC. 20321. For fiscal year 2007, except as otherwise provided by law in effect as of the date of enactment of this division or unless a rate is specifically set by an Act of Congress thereafter, the Administrators of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Western Power Administration, shall use the ‘yield’ rate in computing interest during Construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the cost of Federal power facilities. The yield rate shall be defined as the average yield during the preceding fiscal year on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States which, at the time the computation is made, have terms of 15 years or more remaining to maturity.

“SEC. 20322. The second proviso under the heading ‘Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Nuclear Waste Disposal’ in title III of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20323. The provisos under the heading ‘Atomic Energy Defense Activities, National Nuclear Security Administration, Weapons Activities’ in title III of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20324. The second proviso under the heading ‘Power Marketing Administrations, Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration’ in title III of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20325. Title III of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103) is amended by striking sections 310 and 312.

“SEC. 20326. Section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘October 1, 2006’ and inserting ‘October 1, 2007’.

“CHAPTER 4—FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

“SEC. 20401. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: ‘Export and Investment Assistance, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Subsidy Appropriation’, \$26,382,000; ‘Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States’, \$273,900,000; ‘Bilateral Economic Assistance,

Funds Appropriated to the President, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union', \$452,000,000; 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, Andean Counterdrug Initiative', \$721,500,000; 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, Migration and Refugee Assistance', \$832,900,000; 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund', \$55,000,000; 'Military Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Foreign Military Financing Program', \$4,550,800,000, of which not less than \$2,340,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Israel and \$1,300,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Egypt; and 'Military Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Peacekeeping Operations', \$223,250,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 should be provided for peacekeeping operations in Sudan: *Provided*, That the number in the third proviso under the heading 'Military Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Foreign Military Financing Program' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall be deemed to be \$610,000,000 for the purpose of applying funds appropriated under such heading by this division.

"SEC. 20402. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Economic Support Fund' shall be \$2,455,010,000: *Provided*, That the number in the first proviso under the heading 'Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Economic Support Fund' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall be deemed to be \$120,000,000 for the purpose of applying funds appropriated under such heading by this division: *Provided further*, That the number in the second proviso under the heading 'Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Economic Support Fund' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall be deemed to be \$455,000,000 for the purpose of applying funds appropriated under such heading by this division: *Provided further*, That up to \$50,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza and up to \$50,000,000 shall be made available for the Middle East Partnership Initiative: *Provided further*, That not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available for the fund established by section 2108 of Public Law 109-13: *Provided further*, That the fourteenth and twentieth provisos under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Economic Support Fund' in Public Law 109-102 shall not apply to funds made available under this division.

"SEC. 20403. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, Global HIV/AIDS Initiative', \$3,246,500,000, of which \$377,500,000 shall be made available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, except for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-25) for a United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; and 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, United States Agency for International Development, Child Survival and Health Programs Fund', \$1,718,150,000, of which \$248,000,000 shall be made available for programs and activities to combat malaria.

"SEC. 20404. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be \$0: 'Multilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Contribution to the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency'; 'Multilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation'; and 'Multilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development'.

"SEC. 20405. (a) Of the unobligated balances available from funds appropriated under the heading 'Funds Appropriated to the President, International Financial Institutions, Contribution to the International Development Association' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102), \$31,350,000 is rescinded.

"(b) Of the unobligated balances available from funds appropriated under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Economic Support Fund', \$200,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be derived only from funds not yet expended for cash transfer assistance.

"SEC. 20406. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the eighth proviso under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, United States Agency for International Development, Development Assistance' in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20407. Section 599D of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) is amended by striking 'certifies' and all that follows and inserting the following: 'reports to the appropriate congressional committees on the extent to which the World Bank has completed the following:

"(1) World Bank procurement guidelines have been applied to all procurement financed in whole or in part by a loan from the World Bank or a credit agreement or grant from the International Development Association (IDA).

"(2) The World Bank proposal 'Increasing the Use of Country Systems in Procurement' dated March 2005 has been withdrawn.

"(3) The World Bank maintains a strong central procurement office staffed with senior experts who are designated to address commercial concerns, questions, and complaints regarding procurement procedures and payments under IDA and World Bank projects.

"(4) Thresholds for international competitive bidding have been established to maximize international competitive bidding in accordance with sound procurement practices, including transparency, competition, and cost-effective results for the Borrowers.

"(5) All tenders under the World Bank's national competitive bidding provisions are subject to the same advertisement requirements as tenders under international competitive bidding.

"(6) Loan agreements between the World Bank and the Borrowers have been made public.'

"SEC. 20408. Section 523 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall be applied to funds made available under this division by substituting '\$1,022,086,000' for the first dollar amount.

"SEC. 20409. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions in the Foreign Operations, Export Fi-

nancing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: the proviso in subsection (a) under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'; the eleventh proviso under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, United States Agency for International Development, Development Assistance'; the third proviso under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, Migration and Refugee Assistance'; subsection (d) under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'; the fourth proviso of section 522; subsections (a) and (c) of section 554; and the first proviso of section 593.

"SEC. 20410. The Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283–283z–10) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 39. FIRST REPLENISHMENT OF THE RESOURCES OF THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND.

"(a) CONTRIBUTION AUTHORITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may contribute on behalf of the United States \$150,000,000 to the first replenishment of the resources of the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund.

"(2) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority provided by paragraph (1) may be exercised only to the extent and in the amounts provided for in advance in appropriations Acts.

"(b) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the United States contribution authorized by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$150,000,000, without fiscal year limitation, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury.'

"SEC. 20411. The authority provided by section 801(b)(1)(ii) of Public Law 106-429 shall apply to fiscal year 2007.

"SEC. 20412. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, section 534(m) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall not apply to funds and authorities provided under this division.

"(b) The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101-167) is amended—

"(1) in section 599D (8 U.S.C. 1157 note)—

"(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking 'and 2006' and inserting '2006, and 2007'; and

"(B) in subsection (e), by striking '2006' each place it appears and inserting '2007'; and

"(2) in section 599E (8 U.S.C. 1255 note), in subsection (b)(2), by striking '2006' and inserting '2007'.

"SEC. 20413. Notwithstanding section 653(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2413), the President shall transmit to Congress the report required under section 653(a) of that Act with respect to the provision of funds appropriated by this division: *Provided*, That such report shall include a comparison of amounts, by category of assistance, provided or intended to be provided from funds appropriated for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, for each country and international organization.

"SEC. 20414. The seventh proviso under the heading 'Bilateral Economic Assistance, Funds Appropriated to the President, United States Agency for International Development, Child Survival and Health Programs

Fund' of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-102) shall be applied to funds made available under this division by substituting 'The GAVI Fund' for 'The Vaccine Fund'.

"SEC. 20415. Section 501(i) of H.R. 3425, as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of division B of Public Law 106-113 (appendix E, 113 Stat. 1501A-313), as amended by section 591(b) of division D of Public Law 108-447 (118 Stat. 3037), shall apply to fiscal year 2007.

"CHAPTER 5—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

"SEC. 20501. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: 'Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources', \$862,632,000; 'United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management', \$1,009,037,000; 'National Park Service, Historic Preservation Fund', \$55,663,000; 'United States Geological Survey, Surveys, Investigations, and Research', \$977,675,000; and 'Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Substance Superfund', \$1,251,574,000.

"SEC. 20502. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'National Park Service, Operation of the National Park Service', shall be \$1,758,415,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 may be transferred to the United States Park Police.

"SEC. 20503. Notwithstanding section 101, under 'National Park Service, Construction', the designations under Public Law 109-54 of specific amounts and sources of funding for modified water deliveries and the national historic landmark shall not apply.

"SEC. 20504. The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2007 under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-10a) is rescinded.

"SEC. 20505. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians', shall be \$42,000,000 for payments required for settlements approved by Congress or a court of competent jurisdiction.

"SEC. 20506. Notwithstanding section 101, the 'Minerals Management Service, Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management' shall credit an amount not to exceed \$128,730,000 under the same terms and conditions of the credit to said account as in Public Law 109-54. To the extent \$128,730,000 in addition to receipts are not realized from sources of receipts stated above, the amount needed to reach \$128,730,000 shall be credited to this appropriation from receipts resulting from rental rates for Outer Continental Shelf leases in effect before August 5, 1993.

"SEC. 20507. Notwithstanding section 101, within the amounts made available under 'Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants', \$1,083,817,000, shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and no funds shall be available for making special project grants for the construction of drinking water, wastewater, and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the joint explanatory statement of the managers in Conference Report 109-188.

"SEC. 20508. Notwithstanding section 101, for 'Forest Service, State and Private Forestry', the \$1,000,000 specified in the second proviso and the \$1,500,000 specified in the third proviso in Public Law 109-54 are not required.

"SEC. 20509. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Forest Service, National Forest

System', shall be \$1,445,646,000, except that the \$5,000,000 specified as an additional regional allocation is not required.

"SEC. 20510. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management', shall be \$1,816,091,000 of which the allocation provided for fire suppression operations shall be \$741,477,000; the allocation for hazardous fuels reduction shall be \$298,828,000; and other funding allocations and terms and conditions shall follow Public Law 109-54.

"SEC. 20511. Notwithstanding section 101, of the level for 'Forest Service, Capital Improvement and Maintenance', the \$3,000,000 specified in the third proviso is not required.

"SEC. 20512. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Indian Health Service, Indian Health Services', shall be \$2,817,099,000 and the \$15,000,000 allocation of funding under the eleventh proviso shall not be required.

"SEC. 20513. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$533,218,000, except that current terms and conditions shall not be interpreted to require a specific grant for the Council of American Overseas Research Centers or for the reopening of the Patent Office Building.

"SEC. 20514. Notwithstanding section 101, no additional funding is made available by this division for fiscal year 2007 based on the terms of section 134 and section 437 of Public Law 109-54.

"SEC. 20515. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian Programs' shall be \$1,984,190,000, of which not less than \$75,477,000 is for post-secondary education programs.

"SEC. 20516. The rule referenced in section 126 of Public Law 109-54 shall continue in effect for the 2006-2007 winter use season.

"SEC. 20517. Section 123 of Public Law 109-54 is amended by striking '9' in the first sentence and inserting '10'.

"SEC. 20518. For fiscal year 2007, the Minerals Management Service may retain 3 percent of the amounts disbursed under section 31(b)(1) of the Coastal Impact Assistance Program, authorized by section 31 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1456(a)), for administrative costs, to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 20519. Of the funds made available in section 8098(b) of Public Law 108-287, to construct a wildfire management training facility, \$7,400,000 shall be transferred not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, to the "Forest Service, Wildland Fire Management" account and shall be available for hazardous fuels reduction, hazard mitigation, and rehabilitation activities of the Forest Service.

"SEC. 20520. Section 337 of division E of Public Law 108-447 is amended by striking '2006' and inserting '2007'.

"SEC. 20521. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of the Interior may be used, in relation to any proposal to store water for the purpose of export, for approval of any right-of-way or similar authorization on the Mojave National Preserve or lands managed by the Needles Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or for carrying out any activities associated with such right-of-way or similar approval.

"CHAPTER 6—DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

"SEC. 20601. (a)(1) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services' shall be \$2,670,730,000 plus reimbursements.

"(2) Of the amount provided in paragraph (1)—

"(A) \$1,672,810,000 shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, of which (i) \$341,811,000 shall be for dislocated worker employment and training activities; (ii) \$70,092,000 shall be for the dislocated workers assistance national reserve; (iii) \$79,752,000 shall be for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, including \$74,302,000 for formula grants, \$4,950,000 for migrant and seasonal housing (of which not less than 70 percent shall be for permanent housing), and \$500,000 for other discretionary purposes; (iv) \$878,538,000 shall be for Job Corps operations; (v) \$14,700,000 shall be for carrying out pilots, demonstrations, and research activities authorized by section 171(d) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; (vi) \$49,104,000 shall be for Responsible Reintegration of Youthful Offenders; (vii) \$4,921,000 shall be for Evaluation; and (viii) not less than \$1,000,000 shall be for carrying out the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act (29 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.);

"(B) \$990,000,000 shall be available for obligation for the period April 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, for youth activities, of which \$49,500,000 shall be available for the Youthbuild Program; and

"(C) \$7,920,000 shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2010, for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation and acquisition of Job Corps centers.

"(3) The Secretary of Labor shall award the following grants on a competitive basis: (A) Community College Initiative grants or Community-Based Job Training Grants awarded from amounts provided for such purpose under section 109 of this division and under the Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 2006; and (B) grants for job training for employment in high growth industries awarded during fiscal year 2007 under section 414(c) of the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998.

"(4) None of the funds made available in this division or any other Act shall be available to finalize or implement any proposed regulation under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, or the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act of 2002 until such time as legislation reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform Act of 2002 is enacted.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Employment and Training Administration, Program Administration' shall be \$116,702,000 (together with not to exceed \$82,049,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund), of which \$28,578,000 shall be for necessary expenses for the Office of Job Corps.

"(c) None of the funds made available in this division or under the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall be used to reduce Job Corps total student training slots below 44,491 in program year 2006 or program year 2007.

"(d) Of the funds available under the heading 'Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services' in the Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 2006 for the Responsible Reintegration of Youthful Offenders, \$25,000,000 shall be used for grants to local educational agencies to discourage youth in high-crime urban areas from involvement in violent crime.

"(e) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Employment and Training Administration, Community Service Employment for Older Americans' shall be \$483,611,000.

"(f) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for administrative expenses of 'Employment

and Training Administration, State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations' shall be \$106,252,000 (together with not to exceed \$3,234,098,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund), of which \$63,855,000 shall be available for one-stop career centers and labor market information activities. For purposes of this division, the first proviso under such heading in the Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 2006 shall be applied by substituting '2007' and '2,703,000' for '2006' and '2,800,000', respectively.

"SEC. 20602. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Employee Benefits Security Administration, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$140,834,000, of which no less than \$5,000,000 shall be for the development of an electronic Form 5500 filing system (EFAST2).

"SEC. 20603. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Employment Standards Administration, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$416,308,000 (together with \$2,028,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39 (c), 44(d), and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act).

"SEC. 20604. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$485,074,000, of which \$7,500,000 shall be for continued development of the Occupational Safety and Health Information System, and of which \$10,116,000 shall be for the Susan Harwood training grants program. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the fifth proviso under such heading in the Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20605. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Mine Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$299,836,000.

"SEC. 20606. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Bureau of Labor Statistics, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$468,512,000 (together with not to exceed \$77,067,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund).

"SEC. 20607. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$297,272,000 (together with not to exceed \$308,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund), of which \$72,516,000 shall be for contracts, grants, or other arrangements of Departmental activities conducted by or through the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, including \$60,390,000 for child labor activities, and of which not to exceed \$6,875,000 may remain available until September 30, 2008, for Frances Perkins Building Security Enhancements.

"SEC. 20608. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Veterans Employment and Training, Salaries and Expenses' shall not exceed \$193,753,000 which may be derived from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of sections 4100 through 4113, 4211 through 4215, and 4321 through 4327 of title 38, United States Code, and Public Law 103-353, of which \$1,967,000 is for the National Veterans Employment and Training Services Institute.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 101, the level to carry out the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Programs and the Veterans Workforce Investment Programs shall be \$29,244,000, of which \$7,435,000 shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.

"SEC. 20609. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Office of the Inspector General'

shall be \$66,783,000 (together with not to exceed \$5,552,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund).

"SEC. 20610. Section 193 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2943) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 193. TRANSFER OF FEDERAL EQUITY IN STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY REAL PROPERTY TO THE STATES.

"(a) TRANSFER OF FEDERAL EQUITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal equity acquired in real property through grants to States awarded under title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.) or under the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.) is transferred to the States that used the grants for the acquisition of such equity. The portion of any real property that is attributable to the Federal equity transferred under this section shall be used to carry out activities authorized under this Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49 et seq.), or title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.). Any disposition of such real property shall be carried out in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary and the portion of the proceeds from the disposition of such real property that is attributable to the Federal equity transferred under this section shall be used to carry out activities authorized under this Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, or title III of the Social Security Act.

"(b) LIMITATION ON USE.—A State shall not use funds awarded under this Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, or title III of the Social Security Act to amortize the costs of real property that is purchased by any State on or after the date of enactment of the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007."

"SEC. 20611. (a)(1) Notwithstanding section 101 or any other provision of this division, the level for 'Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services' shall be \$6,883,586,000.

"(2) Of the amount provided in paragraph (1)—

"(A) \$1,988,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b; relating to health centers), of which \$25,000,000 shall be for base grant adjustments for existing health centers and \$13,959,000 shall be for carrying out Public Law 100-579, as amended by section 9168 of Public Law 102-396 (42 U.S.C. 11701 et seq.);

"(B) \$184,746,000 shall be for carrying out title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq.; relating to health professions programs) of which (i) \$31,548,000 shall be for carrying out section 753 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294c; relating to geriatric programs); and (ii) \$48,851,000 shall be for carrying out section 747 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293k; relating to training in primary care medicine and dentistry), of which (I) not less than \$5,000,000 shall be for pediatric dentistry programs; (II) not less than \$5,000,000 shall be for general dentistry programs; and (III) not less than \$24,614,000 shall be for family medicine programs;

"(C) \$1,195,500,000 shall be for carrying out part B of title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff-11 et seq.; relating to Ryan White CARE Grants); and

"(D) \$495,000,000 shall be transferred to 'Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund' to carry out sections 319C-2, 319F, and 319I of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-3b, 247d-6, 247d-7b; relating to hospital preparedness grants, bioterrorism training and curriculum development, and credentialing/emergency systems for advance registration of volunteer health professionals).

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the parenthetical preceding the first proviso under the heading 'Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services' in the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"(c) Amounts made available by this division to carry out parts A and B of title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff-11 et seq.; relating to Ryan White Emergency Relief Grants and CARE Grants) shall remain available for obligation by the Secretary of Health and Human Services through September 30, 2009.

"(d) Any assets and liabilities associated with any program under section 319C-2, 319F, or 319I of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-3b, 247d-6, 247d-7b; relating to hospital preparedness grants, bioterrorism training and curriculum development, and credentialing/emergency systems for advance registration of volunteer health professionals) shall be permanently transferred to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

"SEC. 20612. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Vaccine Injury Compensation Program Trust Fund', for necessary administrative expenses, shall not exceed \$3,964,000.

"SEC. 20613. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Disease Control, Research, and Training' shall be \$5,829,086,000, of which (1) \$456,863,000 shall be for carrying out the immunization program authorized by section 317(a), (j), and (k)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b(a), (j), and (k)(1)); (2) \$99,000,000 shall be for carrying out part A of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w et seq.; relating to preventive health and health services block grants); and (3) \$134,400,000 shall be for equipment, construction, and renovation of facilities.

"(b) None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used to (1) implement section 2625 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ff-33; relating to the Ryan White early diagnosis grant program); or (2) enter into contracts for annual bulk monovalent influenza vaccine.

"(c) Of the amounts made available in the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006 for 'Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Disease Control, Research, and Training', \$29,680,000 for entering into contracts for annual bulk monovalent influenza vaccine is rescinded.

"SEC. 20614. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the levels for the following accounts of the Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, shall be as follows: 'National Institute of Child Health and Human Development', \$1,253,769,000; 'National Center for Research Resources', \$1,133,101,000; 'National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities', \$199,405,000; 'National Library of Medicine', \$319,910,000; and 'Office of the Director', \$1,095,566,000, of which up to \$14,000,000 may be used to carry out section 217 of the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006, \$69,000,000 shall be available to carry out the National Children's Study, and \$483,000,000 shall be available for the Common Fund established under section 402A(c)(1) of the Public Health Service Act.

"(b) The seventh, eighth, and ninth provisos under the heading 'Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Office of the Director' in the

Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006, pertaining to the National Institutes of Health Roadmap for Medical Research, shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“(c) Funds appropriated by this division to the Institutes and Centers of the National Institutes of Health may be expended for improvements and repairs of facilities, as necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the activities authorized herein, not to exceed \$2,500,000 per project.

“SEC. 20615. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management’ shall be \$3,136,006,000, of which \$15,892,000 shall be for Real Choice Systems Change Grants to States, \$48,960,000 shall be for contract costs for the Healthcare Integrated General Ledger Accounting System, and \$106,260,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2008, for contracting reform activities of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

“(b) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall charge fees necessary to cover the costs incurred under ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Program Management’ for conducting revisit surveys on health care facilities cited for deficiencies during initial certification, recertification, or substantiated complaints surveys. Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, receipts from such fees shall be credited to such account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for conducting such surveys.

“SEC. 20616. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the provision of the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006, ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Health Maintenance Organization Loan and Loan Guarantee Fund’, shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20617. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Refugee and Entrant Assistance’ shall be \$587,823,000, of which \$95,302,000 shall be for costs associated with the care and placement of unaccompanied alien children under section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279).

“SEC. 20618. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the first proviso under the heading ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant’ in the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006 may be applied to child care resource and referral and school-aged child care activities without regard to any specific designation therein.

“SEC. 20619. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs’ shall be \$8,937,059,000, of which (1) \$6,888,571,000 shall be for making payments under the Head Start Act; (2) \$186,365,000 shall be for Federal administration; and (3) \$5,000,000 shall be for grants to States for adoption incentive payments, as authorized by section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b).

“SEC. 20620. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs’ shall be \$1,382,859,000, of which \$398,919,000 shall be for Congregate Nutrition Services and \$188,305,000 shall be for Home-Delivered Nutrition Services.

“SEC. 20621. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund’ shall be \$160,027,000, of which \$100,000,000 shall be transferred within 30 days of enactment of the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, to ‘Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Disease Control, Research, and Training’ for preparedness and response to pandemic influenza and other emerging infectious diseases.

“SEC. 20622. Notwithstanding section 208 of the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006, not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) that are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Health and Human Services in this division may be transferred among appropriations, but no such appropriation to which such funds are transferred may be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That an appropriation may be increased by up to an additional 2 percent subject to approval by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority granted by this section shall be available only to meet unanticipated needs and shall not be used to create any new program or to fund any project or activity for which no funds are provided in this division: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

“SEC. 20623. Section 214 of the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ‘2006’ and ‘2007’ for ‘2005’ and ‘2006’, respectively, each place they appear.

“SEC. 20624. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, sections 222 and 223 of the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20625. (a) Notwithstanding section 101 or any other provision of this division, the level for ‘Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged’ shall be \$14,725,593,000.

“(b) Of the amount provided in subsection (a)—

“(1) \$7,172,994,000 shall become available on July 1, 2007, and shall remain available through September 30, 2008, of which (A) \$5,451,387,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA); (B) \$125,000,000 shall be for school improvement grants authorized under section 1003(g) of the ESEA; and (C) not to exceed \$2,352,000 shall be available for section 1608 of the ESEA; and

“(2) \$7,383,301,000 shall become available on October 1, 2007, and shall remain available through September 30, 2008, for academic year 2007-2008, of which (A) \$1,353,584,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA; (B) \$2,332,343,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA; and (C) \$2,332,343,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA.

“(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the last proviso under the heading ‘Department of Education, Education for the Disadvantaged’ in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006 may be applied to activities authorized under part F of title I of the ESEA without regard to any specific designation therein.

“SEC. 20626. For purposes of this division, the proviso under the heading ‘Department of Education, Impact Aid’ shall be applied by substituting ‘2006-2007’ for ‘2005-2006’.

“SEC. 20627. Of the amount provided by section 101 for ‘Department of Education, School Improvement Programs’, \$33,907,000 shall be for programs authorized under part B of title VII of the ESEA and \$33,907,000 shall be for programs authorized under part C of title VII of the ESEA. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the second proviso under such heading in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20628. Notwithstanding section 101 or any other provision of this division, (1) the level for ‘Department of Education, Innovation and Improvement’ shall be \$837,686,000, of which not to exceed \$200,000 shall be for the teacher incentive fund authorized in subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA; and (2) the first proviso under such heading in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006 may be applied to advanced credentialing activities authorized under subpart 5 of part A of title II of the ESEA without regard to any specific designation therein.

“SEC. 20629. Notwithstanding section 101 or any other provision of this division, (1) the level for ‘Department of Education, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education’ shall be \$729,518,000, of which (A) not less than \$72,674,000 shall be used to carry out subpart 10 of part D of title V of the ESEA; and (B) \$48,814,000 shall be used for mentoring programs authorized under section 4130 of the ESEA; and (2) the last proviso under such heading in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006 may be applied to civic education activities authorized under subpart 3 of part C of title II of the ESEA without regard to any specific designation therein.

“SEC. 20630. (a)(1) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Education, Special Education’ shall be \$11,802,867,000.

“(2) Of the amount made available in paragraph (1), \$6,175,912,000 shall become available on July 1, 2007, and shall remain available through September 30, 2008, of which \$5,358,761,000 shall be for State grants authorized under section 611 (20 U.S.C. 1411) of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

“(b) None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used for State personnel development authorized in subpart 1 of part D of the IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.).

“(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the first and second provisos under the heading ‘Department of Education, Special Education’ in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division. For purposes of this division, the last proviso under such heading shall be applied by substituting ‘2006’ for ‘2005’.

“SEC. 20631. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the second appropriation under the heading ‘Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research’ in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20632. The provision pertaining to funding for construction under ‘Department of Education, Special Institutions for Persons With Disabilities, National Technical Institute for the Deaf’ shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20633. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Education, Student Financial Assistance’ shall be \$15,542,456,000.

“(b) The maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 2007-2008 shall be \$4,310.

“SEC. 20634. (a) In addition to the amounts provided under section 101 of this division,

amounts obligated in fiscal year 2006 from funding provided in section 458(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087h(a)(1)) (as reduced by the amount of account maintenance fees obligated to guaranty agencies for fiscal year 2006 pursuant to section 458(a)(1)(B) of that Act) shall be deemed to have been provided in an applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006.

“(b) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Education, Student Aid Administration’ shall be \$718,800,000, to remain available until expended.

“SEC. 20635. Of the amount provided by section 101 for ‘Department of Education, Higher Education’, \$11,785,000 shall be for carrying out section 317 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d).

“SEC. 20636. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Education, Departmental Management, Program Administration’ shall be \$416,250,000, of which \$2,100,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for building alterations and related expenses for the move of Department staff to the Mary E. Switzer building in Washington, DC.

“SEC. 20637. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, section 305 of the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2006 (title III of Public Law 109-149; 119 Stat. 2870) shall not apply to this division.

“SEC. 20638. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Corporation for National and Community Service, Domestic Volunteer Service Programs, Operating Expenses’ shall be \$316,550,000, of which \$3,500,000 shall be for establishment in the Treasury of a VISTA Advance Payments Revolving Fund (in this section referred to as the ‘Fund’) for the Corporation for National and Community Service which, in addition to reimbursements collected from eligible public agencies and private nonprofit organizations pursuant to cost-share agreements, shall be available until expended to make advance payments in furtherance of title I of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4951-4995): *Provided*, That up to 10 percent of funds appropriated to carry out title I of such Act may be transferred to the Fund if the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service determines that the amounts in the Fund are not sufficient to cover expenses of the Fund: *Provided further*, That the Corporation for National and Community Service shall provide detailed information on the activities and financial status of the Fund during the preceding fiscal year in the annual congressional budget justifications to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

“SEC. 20639. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the ‘Corporation for National and Community Service, National and Community Service Programs, Operating Expenses’ shall be \$494,007,000, of which (1) \$117,720,000 shall be transferred to the National Service Trust; and (2) \$31,131,000 shall be for activities authorized under subtitle H of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

“(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the eleventh and thirteenth provisos under the heading ‘Corporation for National and Community Service, National and Community Service Programs, Operating Expenses’ in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“SEC. 20640. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Corporation for National and Community Service, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$68,627,000.

“SEC. 20641. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Corporation for National and

Community Service, Office of Inspector General’ shall be \$4,940,000.

“SEC. 20642. In addition to amounts provided by section 101 of this division, funds appropriated to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission under section 106(b)(1)(B) of the Medicare Improvements and Extension Act of 2006 (division B of Public Law 109-432) shall be used to carry out section 1805 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395b-6).

“SEC. 20643. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Railroad Retirement Board, Dual Benefits Payments Account’ shall be \$88,000,000.

“SEC. 20644. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Railroad Retirement Board, Limitation on Administration’ shall be \$103,018,000.

“SEC. 20645. (a) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the first paragraph under the heading ‘Social Security Administration, Limitation on Administrative Expenses’ shall be \$9,136,606,000.

“(b) CONFORMING CHANGE.—Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the first paragraph under the heading ‘Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income Program’ shall be \$29,058,000,000, of which \$2,937,000,000 shall be for administrative expenses.

“CHAPTER 7—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

“SEC. 20701. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Senate, Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senators’ Official Personnel and Office Expense Account’ shall be \$361,456,000.

“(b)(1) The Architect of the Capitol may acquire (through purchase, lease, transfer from another Federal entity, or otherwise) real property, for the use of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate to support the operations of the Senate—

“(A) subject to the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

“(B) subject to the availability of appropriations and upon approval of an obligation plan by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(2) Subject to the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate may transfer funds for the acquisition or maintenance of any property under paragraph (1) from the account under the heading ‘Senate, Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate’ to the account under the heading ‘Architect of the Capitol, Senate Office Buildings’.

“(3) This subsection shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2007 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(c)(1) Section 10 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-447; 118 Stat. 3170) is amended—

“(A) by inserting ‘(a) IN GENERAL.—’ before ‘The Office’; and

“(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply to fiscal year 2005 and each fiscal year thereafter.”

“(2) The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect as though included in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005.

“SEC. 20702. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$1,129,454,000, to be allocated in accordance with an allocation plan submitted by the Chief Administrative Officer and approved by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(b) Sections 103 and 107 of H.R. 5521, One Hundred Ninth Congress, as passed by the

House of Representatives on June 7, 2006, are enacted into law.

“SEC. 20703. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office’ shall be \$8,490,000, and the provisos under the heading ‘Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office’ in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-55; 119 Stat. 571) shall not apply.

“(b) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Capitol Police, General Expenses’ shall be \$38,500,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2007 shall be paid by the Secretary of Homeland Security from funds available to the Department of Homeland Security.

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Power Plant’ shall be \$73,098,000.

“(2) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Architect of the Capitol, Library Buildings and Grounds’ shall be \$27,375,000.

“(3) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Police Buildings and Grounds’ shall be \$11,753,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2011.

“(4) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts made available under such section for projects and activities described under the heading ‘Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Visitor Center’ in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 may be transferred among the accounts and purposes specified in such heading, upon the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

“(d)(1) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$385,000,000, of which not more than \$6,000,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2007 and shall remain available until expended under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150), and not more than \$350,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2007 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database (and related activities).

“(2) The eighth, tenth, and eleventh provisos under the heading ‘Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses’ in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-55; 119 Stat. 580) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“(3) Of the unobligated balances available under the heading ‘Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses’, the following amounts are rescinded:

“(A) Of the unobligated balances available for the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program, \$47,000,000.

“(B) Of the unobligated balances available for furniture and furnishings, \$695,394.

“(C) Of the unobligated balances available for the acquisition and partial support for implementation of an Integrated Library System, \$1,853,611.

“(4) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Library of Congress, Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$53,505,000, of which \$16,231,000 shall remain available until expended.

“(5) The proviso under the heading ‘Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Salaries and Expenses’ in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-55; 119 Stat. 582) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

“(6) Section 3402 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109-13; 119 Stat. 272) is repealed, and each provision of law amended by such section is restored as if such section had not been enacted into law.

“(e) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Government Printing Office, Government Printing Office Revolving Fund’ shall be \$1,000,000.

“(f) Notwithstanding section 101, the amount applicable under the first proviso under the heading ‘Government Accountability Office, Salaries and Expenses’ in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-55; 119 Stat. 586) shall be \$5,167,900, and the amount applicable under the second proviso under such heading shall be \$2,763,000.

“CHAPTER 8—MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

“SEC. 20801. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Defense for projects authorized in division B of Public Law 109-364 shall be as follows: ‘Military Construction, Army’, \$2,013,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps’, \$1,129,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Air Force’, \$1,083,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Defense-Wide’, \$1,127,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Army National Guard’, \$473,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Air National Guard’, \$126,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Army Reserve’, \$166,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Navy Reserve’, \$43,000,000; and ‘Military Construction, Air Force Reserve’, \$45,000,000.

“SEC. 20802. Of the total amount specified in section 20801, the amount available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, under the headings ‘Military Construction, Army’, ‘Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps’, ‘Military Construction, Air Force’, and ‘Military Construction, Defense-Wide’ shall not exceed \$541,000,000.

“SEC. 20803. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions included in the Military Quality of Life, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-114) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: the first two provisos under the heading ‘Military Construction, Army’; the first proviso under the heading ‘Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps’; the first proviso under the heading ‘Military Construction, Air Force’; and the second proviso under the heading ‘Military Construction, Defense-Wide’.

“SEC. 20804. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for the Department of Defense shall be as follows: ‘Family Housing Construction, Army’, \$579,000,000; ‘Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Army’, \$671,000,000; ‘Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps’, \$305,000,000; ‘Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps’, \$505,000,000; ‘Family Housing Construction, Air Force’, \$1,168,000,000; ‘Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force’, \$750,000,000; ‘Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide’, \$9,000,000; ‘Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’, \$49,000,000; ‘Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide’, \$131,000,000; and ‘Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005’, \$2,489,421,000.

“SEC. 20805. Of the funds made available under the following headings in Public Law 108-132, the following amounts are rescinded: ‘Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps’, \$19,500,000; and ‘Military Construction, Defense-Wide’, \$9,000,000.

“SEC. 20806. Of the funds made available under the following headings in Public Law

108-324, the following amounts are rescinded: ‘Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps’, \$8,000,000; ‘Military Construction, Air Force’, \$2,694,000; ‘Military Construction, Defense-Wide’, \$43,000,000; and ‘Family Housing Construction, Air Force’, \$18,000,000.

“SEC. 20807. Of the funds made available under the following headings in Public Law 109-114, the following amounts are rescinded: ‘Military Construction, Army’, \$43,348,000; ‘Military Construction, Defense-Wide’, \$58,229,000; and ‘Military Construction, Army National Guard’, \$2,129,000.

“SEC. 20808. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be as follows: ‘Veterans Health Administration, Medical Services’, \$25,423,250,000; ‘Veterans Health Administration, Medical Administration’, \$3,156,850,000; ‘Veterans Health Administration, Medical Facilities’, \$3,558,150,000; ‘Departmental Administration, General Operating Expenses’, \$1,472,164,000, provided that the Veterans Benefits Administration shall be funded at not less than \$1,161,659,000; ‘Departmental Administration, Construction, Major Projects’, \$399,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be to make reimbursements as provided in section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612) for claims paid for contracts disputes; and ‘Departmental Administration, National Cemetery Administration’, \$159,983,000.

“SEC. 20809. The first proviso under the heading ‘Veterans Benefits Administration, Compensation and Pensions’ in the Military Quality of Life, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-114) shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting ‘\$28,112,000’ for ‘\$23,491,000’.

“SEC. 20810. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions included in the Military Quality of Life, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-114) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: the first, second, and last provisos, and the set-aside of \$2,200,000,000, under the heading ‘Veterans Health Administration, Medical Services’; the set-aside of \$15,000,000 under the heading ‘Veterans Health Administration, Medical and Prosthetic Research’; the set-aside of \$532,010,000 under the heading ‘Departmental Administration, Construction, Major Projects’; and the set-aside of \$155,000,000 under the heading ‘Departmental Administration, Construction, Minor Projects’.

“SEC. 20811. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following sections included in the Military Quality of Life, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-114) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: section 217, section 224, section 228, section 229, and section 230.

“SEC. 20812. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts of the American Battle Monuments Commission shall be as follows: ‘Salaries and Expenses’, \$37,000,000; and ‘Foreign Currency Fluctuations Account’, \$5,000,000.

“SEC. 20813. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$20,100,000.

“SEC. 20814. Section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2445) is amended by striking the first table of authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects for inside the United States and by adding at the end of the remaining table the last two items in the corresponding table on pages 366 and 367 of House Report 109-702, which is the conference report resolving the disagreeing

votes of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 5122 of the 109th Congress.

“CHAPTER 9—SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

“SEC. 20901. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Department of Justice shall be as follows: ‘General Administration, Salaries and Expenses’, \$97,053,000; ‘General Administration, Justice Information Sharing Technology’, \$123,510,000; ‘General Administration, Narrowband Communications/Integrated Wireless Network’, \$89,188,000; ‘General Administration, Detention Trustee’, \$1,225,788,000; ‘General Administration, Office of Inspector General’, \$70,118,000; ‘United States Parole Commission, Salaries and Expenses’, \$11,424,000; ‘Legal Activities, Salaries and Expenses, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission’, \$1,551,000; ‘United States Marshals Service, Salaries and Expenses’, \$807,967,000; ‘United States Marshals Service, Construction’, \$6,846,000; ‘Salaries and Expenses, Community Relations Service’, \$10,178,000; ‘Assets Forfeiture Fund’, \$21,211,000; ‘Interagency Law Enforcement, Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement’, \$494,793,000; ‘Drug Enforcement Administration, Salaries and Expenses’, \$1,737,412,000; ‘Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Salaries and Expenses’, \$979,244,000; ‘Federal Prison System, Salaries and Expenses’, \$4,974,261,000; ‘Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance’, \$237,689,000; ‘Office of Justice Programs, Community Oriented Policing Services’, \$541,697,000; and ‘Office on Violence Against Women, Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs’, \$382,534,000.

“(b) In addition to the amount otherwise appropriated by this division for ‘Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance’ for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program, there is appropriated \$108,693,000 for such purpose.

“SEC. 20902. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Justice, Legal Activities, Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division’ shall be \$147,002,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$129,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Anti-trust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$18,002,000.

“SEC. 20903. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Justice, Legal Activities, United States Trustee System Fund’, as authorized, shall be \$222,121,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$222,121,000 of offsetting collections pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 589a(b) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the Fund estimated at \$0.

"SEC. 20904. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$5,962,219,000.

"SEC. 20905. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Construction' shall be \$51,392,000.

"SEC. 20906. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Justice, National Security Division', as authorized by section 509A of title 28, United States Code, shall be \$66,741,000; *Provided*, That upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for activities of the National Security Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the National Security Division from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of Public Law 109-108 and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

"SEC. 20907. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Justice, United States Attorneys, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$1,645,613,000.

"SEC. 20908. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Justice, Administrative Review and Appeals' shall be \$228,066,000.

"SEC. 20909. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Justice, General Legal Activities, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$672,609,000.

"SEC. 20910. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Justice, Federal Prison System, Buildings and Facilities' shall be \$432,290,000.

"SEC. 20911. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Bureau of the Census, Periodic Censuses and Programs' shall be \$511,603,000 for necessary expenses related to the 2010 decennial census and \$182,489,000 for expenses to collect and publish statistics for other periodic censuses and programs provided for by law.

"SEC. 20912. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Commerce, Science and Technology, Technology Administration, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$2,000,000.

"SEC. 20913. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the following accounts of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall be as follows: 'Scientific and Technical Research and Services', \$432,762,000; and 'Construction of Research Facilities', \$58,651,000.

"SEC. 20914. Notwithstanding section 101 under 'National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Operations, Research, and Facilities', \$79,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled 'Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries'.

"SEC. 20915. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the following accounts of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be as follows: 'Science, Aeronautics and Exploration', \$10,075,000,000, of which \$5,251,200,000 shall be for science, \$890,400,000 shall be for aeronautics research, \$3,401,600,000 shall be for exploration systems, and \$531,800,000 shall be for cross-agency support programs; 'Exploration Capabilities', \$6,140,000,000; and 'Office of Inspector General', \$32,000,000.

"SEC. 20916. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'National Science Foundation, Research and Related Activities' shall be \$4,665,950,000, of which not to exceed \$485,000,000 shall remain available until ex-

ended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic Program: *Provided*, That from funds provided under this section, such sums as are necessary shall be available for the procurement of polar icebreaking services: *Provided further*, That the National Science Foundation shall reimburse the Coast Guard according to the existing memorandum of agreement.

"SEC. 20917. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Antitrust Modernization Commission, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$462,000.

"SEC. 20918. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Legal Services Corporation, Payment to the Legal Services Corporation' shall be \$348,578,000.

"SEC. 20919. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Department of Justice, General Administration, Working Capital Fund', \$2,500,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20920. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Department of Justice, General Administration, Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund', \$39,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20921. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Department of Justice, Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund', \$8,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20922. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Department of Justice, Legal Activities, Assets Forfeiture Fund', \$170,000,000 shall be rescinded not later than September 30, 2007.

"SEC. 20923. Of the unobligated balances available from prior year appropriations under any 'Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs' account, \$109,000,000 shall be rescinded, of which no more than \$31,000,000 shall be rescinded from 'Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Community Oriented Policing Services', not later than September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That funds made available for 'Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Community Oriented Policing Services' program management and administration shall not be reduced due to such rescission.

"SEC. 20924. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration', \$25,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20925. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Industrial Technology Services', \$7,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20926. The third proviso under the heading 'Department of Justice, Legal Activities, Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys', of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20927. The first through third provisos under the heading 'Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Construction' of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20928. The tenth through twelfth provisos under the heading 'Department of Justice, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Salaries and Expenses' of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20929. The matter pertaining to the National District Attorneys Association in paragraph (12) under the heading 'Depart-

ment of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Community Oriented Policing Services' of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20930. Sections 207, 208, and 209 of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20931. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the following provisions of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108), relating to the Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: the twelfth proviso under the heading 'Operations, Research and Facilities'; the fifth proviso under the heading 'Procurement, Acquisition and Construction'; and the set-aside of \$19,000,000 under the second proviso under the heading 'Fisheries Finance Program Account'.

"SEC. 20932. In the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108), under the heading 'National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Administrative Provisions', the paragraph beginning 'Funding made available under' and all that follows through 'conference report for this Act.' shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20933. Title VIII of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-447, division B) is amended by striking 'fiscal years 2005 and 2006' each place it appears and inserting 'fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007'.

"SEC. 20934. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Commerce, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$1,771,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as offsetting collections assessed and collected pursuant to section 1113 of title 15 of the United States Code, and sections 41 and 376 of title 35 of the United States Code, are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at \$0: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2007, should the total amount of offsetting fee collections be less than \$1,771,000,000, this amount shall be reduced accordingly.

"SEC. 20935. Funds appropriated by section 101 of this division for International Space Station Cargo Crew Services/International Partner Purchases and International Space Station/Multi-User System Support within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be obligated in the account and budget structure set forth in the pertinent Act specified in section 101(a)(8).

"SEC. 20936. The matter pertaining to paragraph (1)(B) under the heading 'Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance' of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20937. The Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108), under the heading 'National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Science, Aeronautics and Exploration' is amended by striking ', of which amounts' and all that follows through 'as amended by Public Law 106-377'.

"SEC. 20938. The Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108), under

the heading 'National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Exploration Capabilities' is amended by striking ', of which amounts' and all that follows through 'as amended by Public Law 106-377'.

"SEC. 20939. Notwithstanding section 101, or any other provision of law, no funds shall be used to implement any Reduction in Force or other involuntary separations (except for cause) by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration prior to September 30, 2007.

"SEC. 20940. Any terms, conditions, uses, or authorities put into effect, available, or exercised pursuant to the reprogramming notification dated August 10, 2006, relating to the Department of Justice with respect to the Office of Justice Programs, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, or the Office on Violence Against Women are hereby made applicable, available, and effective with respect to Fiscal Year 2007 appropriations for those Offices.

"SEC. 20941. Section 824(g) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4064(g)) is amended—

"(1) in paragraph (1)—

"(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking 'To facilitate' and all that follows through 'the Secretary' and inserting 'The Secretary'; and

"(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking 'if' and inserting 'to facilitate the assignment of persons to Iraq and Afghanistan or to posts vacated by members of the Service assigned to Iraq and Afghanistan, if';

"(2) in paragraph (2), by striking 'subparagraphs (A) or (B) of such paragraph' and inserting 'such subparagraph'; and

"(3) in paragraph (3), by striking 'paragraph (1)' and inserting 'paragraph (1)(B)'.

"SEC. 20942. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts and activities shall be \$0: 'Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Centralized Information Technology Modernization Program'; and the grant to the Center for Middle Eastern-Western Dialogue Trust Fund made available in the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108) under the heading 'Department of State, Other, Center for Middle Eastern-Western Dialogue Trust Fund'.

"SEC. 20943. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts shall be as follows: 'Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs', \$445,275,000; 'Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service', \$4,940,000; 'Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan', \$15,826,000; 'Department of State, International Organizations, Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities', \$1,135,275,000; 'Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Operations', \$636,387,000; 'Related Agency, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Broadcasting Capital Improvements', \$7,624,000; and 'Related Agencies, Commission on International Religious Freedom, Salaries and Expenses', \$3,000,000.

"SEC. 20944. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the fourth proviso under the heading 'Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs' in the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108) and section 406 of such Act shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

"SEC. 20945. The appropriation to the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to this division shall be deemed a regular ap-

propriation for purposes of section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) and sections 13(e), 14(g), and 31(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(e), 78n(g), and 78ee(k)).

"SEC. 20946. Section 302 of the Universal Service Antideficiency Temporary Suspension Act (Public Law 108-494; 118 Stat. 3998) is amended by striking 'December 31, 2006,' each place it appears and inserting 'December 31, 2007,'.

"SEC. 20947. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Small Business Administration, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$326,733,000, and section 613 of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-108; 119 Stat. 2336) shall not apply to such funds.

"SEC. 20948. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Small Business Administration, Disaster Loans Program Account' shall be \$113,850,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, of which \$112,365,000 may be transferred to and merged with 'Small Business Administration, Salaries and Expenses', and of which \$1,485,000 is for the Office of Inspector General of the Small Business Administration for audits and reviews of disaster loans and the disaster loan program and shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for the Office of Inspector General.

"SEC. 20949. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Small Business Administration, Salaries and Expenses', \$6,100,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20950. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Small Business Administration, Business Loans Program Account', \$5,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 20951. Of the unobligated balances available under the heading 'Small Business Administration, Disaster Loans Program Account', \$2,300,000 is rescinded.

"CHAPTER 10—TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 21001. Of the amounts provided by section 101 for 'Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary, Transportation, Planning, Research, and Development', for activities of the Department of Transportation, up to \$9,900,000 may be made available for the purpose of agency facility improvements and associated administrative costs as determined necessary by the Secretary.

"SEC. 21002. (a) Section 44302(f)(1) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for 'August 31, 2006, and may extend through December 31, 2006'.

"(b) Section 44303(b) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for 'December 31, 2006'.

"SEC. 21003. Of the funds made available under section 101(a)(2) of Public Law 107-42, \$50,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 21004. Notwithstanding section 101, no funds are provided by this division for activities or reimbursements described in section 185 of Public Law 109-115.

"SEC. 21005. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Federal Aviation Administration, Operations' shall be \$8,330,750,000, of which \$5,627,900,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which no less than \$6,704,223,000 shall be for air traffic organization activities; no less than \$997,718,000 shall be for aviation regulation

and certification activities; not to exceed \$11,641,000 shall be available for commercial space transportation activities; not to exceed \$76,175,000 shall be available for financial services activities; not to exceed \$85,313,000 shall be available for human resources program activities; not to exceed \$275,156,000 shall be available for region and center operations and regional coordination activities; not to exceed \$144,617,000 shall be available for staff offices; and not to exceed \$35,907,000 shall be available for information services.

"SEC. 21006. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Federal Aviation Administration, Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)' shall be \$130,000,000.

"SEC. 21007. Of the amounts provided by section 101 for limitation on obligations under 'Federal Aviation Administration, Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)', not to exceed \$74,971,000 shall be obligated for administrative expenses; up to \$17,870,000 shall be available for airport technology research, to remain available until expended; not less than \$10,000,000 shall be for airport cooperative research; and \$10,000,000 shall be available and transferred to 'Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses' to administer the small community air service development program to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 21008. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for liquidation of contract authorization under 'Federal Aviation Administration, Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)' shall be \$4,399,000,000.

"SEC. 21009. Of the amounts authorized for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and prior years under sections 48103 and 48112 of title 49, United States Code, \$621,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 21010. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Federal Highway Administration, Federal-Aid Highways (Limitation on Obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)' shall be \$39,086,464,683.

"SEC. 21011. Notwithstanding section 101, sections 110, 112, and 113 of division A of Public Law 109-115 shall not apply to fiscal year 2007.

"SEC. 21012. Funds appropriated under this division pursuant to section 1069(y) of Public Law 102-240 shall be distributed in accordance with the formula set forth in section 1116(a) of Public Law 109-59.

"SEC. 21013. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the limitation on obligations and transfer of contract authority for 'National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund) (Including Transfer of Funds)' shall be \$121,232,430: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever an allocation is made of the sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the Federal lands highway program, and whenever an apportionment is made of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, the National Highway System, the Interstate maintenance program, the bridge program, the Appalachian development highway system, and the equity bonus program, the Secretary of Transportation shall deduct from all sums so authorized such sums as may be necessary to fund this section: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this section shall be transferred by the Secretary of Transportation to and administered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: *Provided further*, That the

Federal share payable on account of any program, project, or activity carried out with funds made available under this section shall be 100 percent: *Provided further*, That the sum deducted in accordance with this section shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That all funds made available under this section shall be subject to any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs set forth in this division or any other Act: *Provided further*, That the obligation limitation made available for the programs, projects, and activities for which funds are made available under this section shall remain available until used and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for future fiscal years: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, prior to making any distribution of obligation limitation for the Federal-aid highway program under section 1102 of Public Law 109-59 for fiscal year 2007, the Secretary of Transportation shall not distribute from such limitation amounts provided under this section: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in allocating funds for the equity bonus program under section 105 of title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 2007, the Secretary of Transportation shall make the required calculations under that section as if this section had not been enacted.

“SEC. 21014. Of the unobligated balances of funds apportioned to each State under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, \$3,471,582,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That such rescission shall not apply to the funds distributed in accordance with sections 130(f) and 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code; sections 133(d)(1) and 163 of such title, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 109-59; and the first sentence of section 133(d)(3)(A) of such title.

“SEC. 21015. Notwithstanding section 101 and section 111, the level for each of the following accounts under the heading ‘Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration’ shall be as follows: ‘Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)’, \$223,000,000; and ‘Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)’, \$294,000,000.

“SEC. 21016. Notwithstanding section 101 and section 111, the level for each of the following accounts under the heading ‘National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’ shall be as follows: ‘Operations and Research (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)’, \$107,750,000; ‘National Driver Register (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)’, \$4,000,000; and ‘Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Highway Trust Fund)’, \$587,750,000.

“SEC. 21017. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Federal Railroad Administration, Safety and Operations’ shall be \$149,570,000.

“SEC. 21018. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Federal Railroad Administration, Railroad Research and Development’ shall be \$34,524,000.

“SEC. 21019. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Federal Railroad Administration, Efficiency Incentive Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation’ shall be \$31,300,000 and section 135 of division A of Public Law 109-115 shall not apply to fiscal year 2007.

“SEC. 21020. Notwithstanding section 101, no funds are appropriated under this division

for ‘Federal Railroad Administration, Alaska Railroad Rehabilitation’.

“SEC. 21021. Notwithstanding section 101 and section 111, the level for each of the following accounts under the heading ‘Federal Transit Administration’ shall be as follows: ‘Administrative Expenses’, \$85,000,000; ‘Research and University Research Centers’, \$61,000,000; and ‘Capital Investment Grants’, \$1,566,000,000.

“SEC. 21022. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the liquidation of contract authorizations for ‘Federal Transit Administration, Formula and Bus Grants (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)’ available for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of sections 5305, 5307, 5308, 5309, 5310, 5311, 5316, 5317, 5320, 5335, 5339, and 5340 of title 49, United States Code, and section 3038 of Public Law 105-178 shall be \$4,660,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

“SEC. 21023. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the limitation on obligations for ‘Federal Transit Administration, Formula and Bus Grants (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Limitation on Obligations) (Including Transfer of Funds)’ shall be \$7,262,775,000: *Provided*, That no funds made available to modernize fixed guideway systems shall be transferred to ‘Capital Investment Grants’.

“SEC. 21024. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or limited under this division and made available to carry out the new fixed guideway program of the Federal Transit Administration shall be allocated at the discretion of the Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration for projects authorized under subsections (a) through (c) of section 3043 of Public Law 109-59 and for activities authorized under section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

“SEC. 21025. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Maritime Administration, Operations and Training’ shall be \$111,127,000.

“SEC. 21026. Of the unobligated balances under the heading ‘Maritime Administration, National Defense Tank Vessel Construction Program’, \$74,400,000 is rescinded.

“SEC. 21027. Of the unobligated balances under the heading ‘Maritime Administration, Ship Construction’, \$2,000,000 is rescinded.

“SEC. 21028. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts under the heading ‘Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration’ shall be as follows: ‘Administrative Expenses’, \$18,000,000; ‘Hazardous Materials Safety’, \$26,663,000; and ‘Pipeline Safety (Pipeline Safety Fund) (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund)’, \$74,832,000, of which \$14,850,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2009, of which \$59,982,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$24,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009.

“SEC. 21029. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Research and Innovative Technology Administration, Research and Development’ shall be \$7,716,260, of which \$2,000,000 shall be for the air transportation statistics program.

“SEC. 21030. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Transportation, Office of Inspector General, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$63,643,000.

“SEC. 21031. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for the ‘National Transportation Safety Board, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$78,854,000.

“SEC. 21032. Of the available unobligated balances made available to the ‘National Transportation Safety Board’ under Public Law 106-246, \$1,000,000 is rescinded.

“SEC. 21033. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Tenant-Based Rental Assistance’ shall be \$15,920,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$11,727,000,000 shall be available on October 1, 2006, and notwithstanding section 109, \$4,193,000,000 shall be available on October 1, 2007: *Provided*, That paragraph (1) under such heading in Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2440) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division: *Provided further*, That of the amounts available for such heading, \$14,436,200,000 shall be for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.)) (‘the Act’ herein): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under the second proviso under this section the Secretary shall, for the calendar year 2007 funding cycle, provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the most recently completed period of 12 consecutive months for which the Secretary determines the data is verifiable and complete, prior to prorations, and by applying the 2007 Annual Adjustment Factor as established by the Secretary, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of tenant protection or HOPE VI vouchers or vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount provided under the second proviso under this section, pro rate each public housing agency’s allocation otherwise established pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following proviso, the entire amount provided under the second proviso under this section shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the Moving to Work demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their Moving to Work agreements and shall be subject to the same pro rata adjustments under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That from amounts provided under the second proviso of this section up to \$100,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from the portability under section 8(r) of the Act of tenant-based rental assistance; and (2) for adjustments for public housing agencies that could experience a significant decrease in voucher funding that could result in the risk of loss of voucher units due to the shift to using VMS data based on a 12-month period: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under the second proviso of this section may be used to support a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency’s authorized level of units under contract.

“SEC. 21034. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for Public and Indian Housing of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be as follows: ‘Project-Based Rental Assistance’, \$5,976,417,000, of which \$5,829,303,000 shall be for activities specified in paragraph (1) under such heading in Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2442); ‘Public Housing Operating Fund’, \$3,864,000,000; and ‘Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account’,

\$6,000,000: *Provided*, That such funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$251,000,000.

"SEC. 21035. Of the unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated under the headings referred to under the heading 'Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing, Housing Certificate Fund' in Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2442) for fiscal year 2006 and prior years, \$1,650,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That the provisions under such heading shall be applied to such rescission by substituting 'September 30, 2007' for 'September 30, 2006' and '2007 funding cycle' for '2006 funding cycle'.

"SEC. 21036. None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used for the following activities under the heading 'Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public and Indian Housing' in Public Law 109-115: the activities specified in the last three provisos under the heading 'Public Housing Capital Fund' (119 Stat. 2444); and the first activity specified in the second proviso under the heading 'Native American Housing Block Grants' (119 Stat. 2445).

"SEC. 21037. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for Community Planning and Development of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be as follows: 'Community Development Fund', \$3,771,900,000, of which \$3,710,916,000 shall be for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this section for such account may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative, neighborhood initiatives, or YouthBuild program activities; 'Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program', \$49,390,000, of which \$19,800,000 shall be for the Self Help Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, and \$29,590,000 shall be made available through a competition for activities authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note); and 'Homeless Assistance Grants', \$1,441,600,000.

"SEC. 21038. None of the funds appropriated by this division may be used for activities specified in the first proviso under the heading 'Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Programs, Housing for the Elderly' in Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2452).

"SEC. 21039. The first proviso in the first paragraph under the heading 'Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Administration, General and Special Risk Program Account' in Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2454) shall be applied in fiscal year 2007 by substituting "\$45,000,000,000" for "\$35,000,000,000".

"SEC. 21040. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of Housing and Urban Development, Policy Development and Research, Research and Technology' shall be \$50,087,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this section for such account may be used for activities under the first four provisos under such heading in Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2455).

"SEC. 21041. Funds appropriated by this division for 'Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Lead Hazard Control, Lead Hazard Reduction' shall be made available without regard to the limitations that are set forth after 'needs' in the second proviso under such heading in Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2457)".

"SEC. 21042. The provisions of title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

(42 U.S.C. 11311 et seq.) shall continue in effect, notwithstanding section 209 of such Act, through the earlier of (1) the date specified in section 106 of this division, or (2) the date of the enactment into law of an authorization Act relating to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

"SEC. 21043. (a) Section 579 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (42 U.S.C. 1437f note) is amended—

"(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking 'October 1, 2006' and inserting 'October 1, 2011', and

"(2) in subsection (b), by striking 'October 1, 2006' and inserting 'October 1, 2011'.

"(b) The repeal made by section 579(a)(1) of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 shall be deemed not to have taken effect before the date of the enactment of the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007, and subtitle A of such Act shall be in effect as if no such repeal had been made before such date of enactment.

"SEC. 21044. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(g)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until the date specified in section 106 of this division, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under section 255 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(g)).

"SEC. 21045. Section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v) is amended—

"(1) in subsection (m)(1), by striking '2003' and inserting '2007'; and

"(2) in subsection (o), by striking "September 30, 2006" and inserting "September 30, 2007".

"SEC. 21046. Section 710 of Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2491) shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting '2007' and '30 days' for '2006' and '60 days', respectively.

"SEC. 21047. Section 711 of Public Law 109-115 (119 Stat. 2492) shall be applied to funds appropriated by this division by substituting '2007' for '2006' each place it appears, and by substituting 'September 30, 2008' for 'September 30, 2007'.

"SEC. 21048. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of the Treasury, Departmental Offices, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$215,167,000, of which not less than \$23,826,000 shall be for the following increases for the following activities: \$9,352,000 to expand the overseas presence of the Department of the Treasury; \$3,761,000 for intelligence analysts; \$1,000,000 for additional secure workspace for intelligence analysts; \$2,050,000 to support the Department of the Treasury's participation as co-lead agency in the Iraq Threat Finance Cell; \$1,483,000 to support economic sanctions efforts against terrorist networks; \$946,000 to support economic sanctions efforts against proliferators of Weapons of Mass Destruction; \$542,000 for General Counsel support of the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence; \$492,000 for Chief Counsel support of the Office of Foreign Assets Control; and \$4,200,000 to reimburse the United States Secret Service for the security detail to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"SEC. 21049. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Department of the Treasury, Departmental Offices, Department-wide Systems and Capital Investments Programs' shall be \$30,268,000, of which not less than \$6,100,000 shall be for an increase for the Treasury Foreign Intelligence Network.

"SEC. 21050. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts of the Internal Revenue Service shall be as follows: 'Taxpayer Services', \$2,142,042,391;

'Enforcement', \$4,708,440,879; 'Operations Support', \$3,461,204,720; 'Health Insurance Tax Credit Administration', \$14,846,000; and 'Business Systems Modernization', \$212,310,000.

"SEC. 21051. Funds appropriated by section 101 of this division for the Internal Revenue Service may be obligated in the account and budget structure set forth in title II of H.R. 5576 (109th Congress), as passed by the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 21052. Funds for the Internal Revenue Service for fiscal year 2007 under the 'Taxpayer Services', 'Enforcement', and 'Operations Support' accounts may be transferred between the accounts and among budget activities to the extent necessary to implement the restructuring of the Internal Revenue Service accounts after notice of the amount and purpose of the transfer is provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate and a period of 30 days has elapsed: *Provided*, That the limitation on transfers is 10 percent in fiscal year 2007.

"SEC. 21053. Funds appropriated by this division for 'Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization' are available for obligation without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for employee salaries and expenses.

"SEC. 21054. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'The Judiciary, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Salaries and Expenses' shall be \$4,498,130,000, of which \$20,371,000 shall be available for critically understaffed workload associated with immigration and other law enforcement needs.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 402 of Public Law 109-115, of the amount provided by this section, not to exceed \$80,954,000 shall be available for transfer between accounts to maintain fiscal year 2006 operating levels.

"SEC. 21055. Notwithstanding section 101, within the amount provided by this division for 'The Judiciary, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Salaries and Expenses', \$990,000 shall not be required for the National Academy of Public Administration for a review of the financial and management procedures of the Federal Judiciary.

"SEC. 21056. Section 203(c) of the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-650; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), is amended—

"(1) in the second sentence, by inserting 'the district of Kansas,' after 'Except with respect to'; and

"(2) by inserting after the second sentence the following: 'The first vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of Kansas occurring 16 years or more after the confirmation date of the judge named to fill the temporary judgeship created for such district under this subsection, shall not be filled.'.

"SEC. 21057. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Office of National Drug Control Policy, Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center' shall be \$20,000,000, which shall remain available until, and obligated and expended by, September 30, 2008, consisting of \$10,000,000 for counternarcotics research and development projects, of which up to \$1,000,000 is to be directed to supply reduction activities, and \$10,000,000 for the continued operation of the technology transfer program.

"(b) The Office of National Drug Control Policy shall expend funds provided for 'Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center' by Public Law 109-115 in accordance with the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference for Public Law 109-115 (House Report 109-307) within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section.

"(c) Funding for counternarcotics research and development projects shall be available

for transfer to other Federal departments or agencies within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this section. Any unexpended funds from previous fiscal years shall be expended in fiscal year 2007 to reinstate the demand instrumentation program as instructed in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference for Public Law 109-115 (House Report 109-307). The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an accounting of fiscal year 2006 funds, including funds that are unexpended for fiscal year 2007.

“SEC. 21058. The structure of any of the offices or components within the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall remain as they were on October 1, 2006, and none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used to implement a reorganization of offices within the Office of National Drug Control Policy without the explicit approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

“SEC. 21059. (a) Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for ‘Federal Drug Control Programs, High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program’ shall remain available until September 30, 2008.

“(b) The Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit a plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for the initial High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas allocation funding within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section and the discretionary High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas funding within 150 days after the date of the enactment of this section. Within the discretionary funding amount, \$2,000,000 shall be available for new counties, not including previously funded counties, with priority given to meritorious applicants who have submitted applications previously and have not been funded.

“SEC. 21060. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Election Assistance Commission, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$16,236,000, of which \$4,950,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for election reform activities authorized under the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

“SEC. 21061. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for each of the following accounts for the General Services Administration shall be as follows: ‘Operating Expenses’, \$82,975,000; and ‘Office of Inspector General’, \$52,312,000.

“SEC. 21062. Notwithstanding GSA Order ADM 5440 of December 21, 2006, the Office of Governmentwide Policy and the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs shall continue to exist and operate separately, and none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division or any other Act may be used to establish or operate an Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs and Governmentwide Policy or any combination thereof without the explicit approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

“SEC. 21063. Notwithstanding section 101—

“(1) the aggregate amount of new obligational authority provided under the heading ‘General Services Administration, Real Property Activities, Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue’ for Federal buildings and courthouses and other purposes of the Fund shall be \$7,598,426,000, including repayment of debt, of which not less than \$280,872,000 shall be for courthouse construction, and not less than \$96,539,000 shall be for border station construction, and of which \$89,061,000 shall be

from the additional amount provided by paragraph (2) of this subsection;

“(2) for an additional amount to be deposited in the ‘General Services Administration, Real Property Activities, Federal Buildings Fund’, \$89,061,000 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated;

“(3) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to initiate design, construction, repair, alteration, leasing, and other projects through existing authorities of the Administrator: *Provided*, That the General Services Administration shall submit a detailed plan, by project, regarding the use of funds to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days of enactment of this section; and

“(4) none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this division for the ‘General Services Administration, Real Property Activities, Federal Buildings Fund’ may be obligated for the Coast Guard consolidation and development of St. Elizabeths campus in the District of Columbia.

“SEC. 21064. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Merit Systems Protection Board, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$35,814,000, together with not to exceed \$2,579,000 for administrative expenses to adjudicate retirement appeals to be transferred from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in amounts determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board.

“SEC. 21065. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘National Archives and Records Administration, Electronic Records Archives’ shall be \$45,214,000.

“SEC. 21066. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘National Archives and Records Administration, Repairs and Restoration’ shall be \$9,120,000.

“(b) Within the amount provided by this section, the following amounts shall not be required:

“(1) \$1,485,000 for construction of a new regional archives and records facility.

“(2) \$990,000 for repair and restoration of a plaza surrounding a presidential library.

“SEC. 21067. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘National Archives and Records Administration, Operating Expenses’ shall be \$278,235,000.

“(b) Within the amount provided by this section, \$1,980,000 shall not be required for the initial move of records, staffing, and operations of a presidential library.

“SEC. 21068. Section 403(f) of Public Law 103-356 (31 U.S.C. 501 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106 of this division for ‘October 1, 2006’.

“SEC. 21069. The text of section 405 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended to read as follows: ‘There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2007’.

“SEC. 21070. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Office of Personnel Management, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$111,095,000, of which \$6,913,170 shall remain available until expended for the Enterprise Human Resources Integration project and \$1,435,500 shall remain available until expended for the Human Resources Line of Business project; and in addition \$112,017,000 for administrative expenses, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management without regard to other statutes, including direct procurement of printed materials, for the retirement and insurance programs, of which \$13,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the cost of automating the retirement recordkeeping systems.

“SEC. 21071. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Office of Special Counsel, Salaries and Expenses’ shall be \$15,407,000.

“SEC. 21072. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘United States Postal Service, Payment to the Postal Service Fund’ shall be \$29,000,000; and, in addition, \$6,915,000, which shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 2007, and shall be in addition to amounts provided under section 109.

“SEC. 21073. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Federal Payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia’, shall be \$209,594,000, of which \$133,476,000 shall be for necessary expenses of the Community Supervision and Sex Offender Registration, \$45,220,000 shall be available to the Pretrial Services Agency, and \$30,898,000 shall be transferred to the Public Defender Service of the District of Columbia.

“(b) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Federal Payment to the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia’ shall be \$20,000,000, and shall be used only for upgrading and expanding public transportation capacity, in accordance with an expenditure plan submitted by the Mayor of the District of Columbia not later than 60 days after the enactment of this section which details the activities to be carried out with such Federal Payment. Such Federal Payment may be applied to expenditures incurred as of October 1, 2006.

“(c) Notwithstanding section 101, any appropriation or funds made available to the District of Columbia pursuant to this division for ‘Federal Payment for School Improvement’ which are made available to expand quality public charter schools in the District of Columbia shall remain available until expended to the extent that the appropriation or funds are used for public charter school credit enhancement and direct loans.

“(d) Notwithstanding section 101, no appropriation or funds shall be made available to the District of Columbia pursuant to this division with respect to any of the following items in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-115; 119 Stat. 2508 et seq.):

“(1) The item relating to ‘Federal Payment for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program’.

“(2) The item relating to ‘Federal Payment for Marriage Development and Improvement’.

“(e) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Federal Payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia’ shall be \$8,533,000.

“(f) Notwithstanding section 101, the level for ‘Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts’ shall be \$43,475,000.

“(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds for programs and activities under the heading ‘District of Columbia Funds’ for such programs and activities under title V of H.R. 5576 (109th Congress), as passed by the House of Representatives, at the rate set forth under ‘District of Columbia Funds, Summary of Expenses’ as included in the Fiscal Year 2007 Proposed Budget and Financial Plan submitted to the Congress by the District of Columbia on June 5, 2006 as amended on January 16, 2007.

“(h) Section 203(c) of the 2005 District of Columbia Omnibus Authorization Act (Public Law 109-356; 120 Stat. 2038) is amended by striking ‘6 months’ and inserting ‘1 year’.

“(i) Not later than 60 days after the enactment of this section, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall submit a plan for the expenditure of the funds made available to the District of Columbia pursuant to this division to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

“SEC. 21074. Within the amount provided by this division for ‘Other Federal Drug Control

Programs', the following amount shall not be required: \$1,980,000 as a directed grant to the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America for the National Community Anti-Drug Coalition Institute, as authorized in chapter 2 of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988, as amended.

"SEC. 21075. Within the amount provided by this division for 'Other Federal Drug Control Programs', \$1,980,000 is provided, as authorized, under the Drug-Free Communities Support Program, for training, technical assistance, evaluation, research, and capacity building for coalitions.

"SEC. 21076. Notwithstanding section 101, no funds shall be appropriated or otherwise made available by this division for the following accounts of the Department of the Treasury: 'Air Transportation Stabilization Program Account'; and 'Treasury Building and Annex Repair and Restoration'.

"SEC. 21077. For purposes of this division, section 206 of Public Law 109-115 shall not apply.

"SEC. 21078. (a) The Federal Election Commission may charge and collect fees for attending or otherwise participating in a conference sponsored by the Commission, and notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, any amounts received from such fees during a fiscal year shall be credited to and merged with the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Commission during the year, and shall be available for use during the year for the costs of sponsoring such conferences.

"(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2007 and each succeeding fiscal year.

"CHAPTER 11—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

"SEC. 21101. Not to exceed \$155,600,000 shall be transferred to 'Department of Homeland Security, Transportation Security Administration, Expenses', to liquidate obligations incurred against funds appropriated in fiscal years 2002 and 2003, of which \$150,300,000 shall be from unobligated balances currently available to the Transportation Security Administration, \$300,000 shall be from unobligated balances currently available to the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, and \$5,000,000 shall be from unobligated balances currently available to the Under Secretary for Management: *Provided*, That the Transportation Security Administration shall not utilize any unobligated balances from the following programs: screener partnership program; explosive detection system purchase; explosive detection system installation; checkpoint support; aviation regulation and other enforcement; air cargo; air cargo research and development; and operation integration: *Provided further*, That of the funds transferred, \$2,000,000 shall be from the 'Secure Flight Program'; \$100,000 shall be from the 'Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary'; \$100,000 shall be from the 'Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs'; \$100,000 shall be from the 'Office of Public Affairs'; and \$5,000,000 shall be from 'MAX-HR Human Resource System'.

"This division may be cited as the 'Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007'."

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DeFAZIO). The gentleman from Georgia demands the question of consideration. Under clause 3 of rule XVI, the question is: Will the House now consider the joint resolution?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I ask for a division on that vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote has already been ordered. The vote will proceed. Members will record their vote by electronic device. It will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 179, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—222

Allen	Hare	Obey
Altmire	Harman	Olver
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Arcuri	Herseth	Pascrell
Baca	Hill	Pastor
Baird	Hinche	Payne
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Barrow	Hirono	Peterson (MN)
Bean	Hodes	Pomeroy
Becerra	Holden	Porter
Berkley	Holt	Price (NC)
Berman	Honda	Rahall
Berry	Hooley	Ramstad
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Inslee	Reyes
Blumenauer	Israel	Rodriguez
Boren	Issa	Ross
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Rothman
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Boyd (KS)	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Brady (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Braley (IA)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Brown, Corrine	Kagen	T.
Capps	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cardoza	Kildee	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Kilpatrick	Schiff
Carson	Kind	Schwartz
Castor	Klein (FL)	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Clarke	Lampson	Serrano
Clay	Langevin	Sestak
Cleaver	Lantos	Shea-Porter
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Shuler
Conyers	Lee	Simpson
Cooper	Levin	Sires
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Costello	Lipinski	Slaughter
Courtney	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lofgren, Zoe	Snyder
Crowley	Lowe	Solis
Cuellar	Lynch	Space
Cummings	Mahoney (FL)	Spratt
Davis (AL)	Markey	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Marshall	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Matheson	Tanner
Davis, Lincoln	Matsui	Tauscher
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor
DeGette	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McIntyre	Tierney
Dingell	McNerney	Towns
Doggett	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Ellison	Melancon	Visclosky
Ellsworth	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Emanuel	Millender-	Wasserman
Engel	McDonald	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Waters
Etheridge	Miller, George	Watson
Fattah	Mitchell	Watt
Filner	Mollohan	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Weiner
Giffords	Moore (WI)	Welch (VT)
Gillibrand	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (OH)
Gordon	Murphy, Patrick	Woolsey
Green, Al	Murtha	Wu
Green, Gene	Nadler	Wynn
Grijalva	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	
Hall (NY)	Oberstar	

NOES—179

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Akin	Galleghy	Pearce
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Pence
Bachus	Gerlach	Petri
Baker	Gillmor	Pickering
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Pitts
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Platts
Barton (TX)	Goode	Poe
Biggert	Goodlatte	Price (GA)
Billbray	Granger	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Graves	Putnam
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Blackburn	Hayes	Regula
Blunt	Heller	Rehberg
Boehner	Hensarling	Reichert
Bonner	Herger	Renzi
Bono	Hobson	Rogers (AL)
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jindal	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Burton (IN)	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Jordan	Sali
Camp (MI)	Keller	Saxton
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Schmidt
Cannon	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Kirk	Sessions
Capito	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Carter	Knollenberg	Shays
Castle	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Chabot	LaHood	Shuster
Coble	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Cubin	Linder	Stearns
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Tancredo
Davis, David	Lucas	Terry
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Thornberry
Deal (GA)	E.	Tiahrt
Dent	Mack	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Turner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Upton
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Walberg
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Walden (OR)
Dreier	McCotter	Walsh (NY)
Duncan	McHenry	Wamp
Ehlers	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Emerson	McKeon	Weller
English (PA)	McMorris	Westmoreland
Everett	Rodgers	Whitfield
Fallin	Mica	Wicker
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Ferguson	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)
Fortenberry	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)
Fox	Musgrave	
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	

NOT VOTING—33

Abercrombie	Fossella	McDermott
Ackerman	Gilchrist	Myrick
Alexander	Hastert	Norwood
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (WA)	Ortiz
Ginny	Higgins	Paul
Butterfield	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)
Buyer	Jones (OH)	Reynolds
Carney	Kennedy	Rush
Culberson	King (NY)	Stark
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Sullivan
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	
Farr	McCrery	

□ 1258

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. SALI changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table the motion to reconsider.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 180, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—226

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Allen	Hall (NY)	Obey
Altmire	Hare	Oliver
Andrews	Harman	Ortiz
Arcuri	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Baca	Herse	Pascarella
Baird	Hill	Pastor
Baldwin	Hinchey	Payne
Barrow	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bean	Hirono	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hodes	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Holden	Pomeroy
Berman	Holt	Price (NC)
Berry	Honda	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Reyes
Blumenauer	Inslee	Rodriguez
Boren	Israel	Ross
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Rothman
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	(TX)	Rush
Boyd (KS)	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Brady (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Braley (IA)	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Linda
Brown, Corrine	Kagen	T.
Butterfield	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Capps	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Capuano	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Cardoza	Kildee	Schiff
Carnahan	Kilpatrick	Schwartz
Carney	Kind	Scott (GA)
Carson	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)
Castor	Kucinich	Serrano
Chandler	Lampson	Sestak
Clarke	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Clay	Lantos	Sherman
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Shuler
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Simpson
Cohen	Lee	Sires
Conyers	Levin	Skelton
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Costa	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Costello	Loeb	Snyder
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Solis
Cramer	Lowey	Space
Crowley	Lynch	Spratt
Cuellar	Mahoney (FL)	Stupak
Cummings	Markey	Sutton
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Tanner
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Lincoln	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	McCollum (MN)	Tierney
DeGette	McGovern	Towns
Delahunt	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
DeLauro	McNerney	Udall (NM)
Dicks	McNulty	Van Hollen
Dingell	Meehan	Velázquez
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Donnelly	Meeks (NY)	Walz (MN)
Doyle	Melancon	Wasserman
Edwards	Michaud	Schultz
Ellison	Millender	Waters
Ellsworth	McDonald	Watson
Emanuel	Miller (NC)	Watt
Engel	Miller, George	Waxman
Eshoo	Mitchell	Weiner
Etheridge	Mollohan	Welch (VT)
Fattah	Moore (KS)	Weller
Filner	Moore (WI)	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Wilson (OH)
Gillibrand	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick	Wu
Gordon	Murtha	Wynn
Green, Al	Nadler	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Napolitano	

NOES—180

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Akin	Gerlach	Pearce
Bachmann	Gillmor	Pence
Baker	Gingrey	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Pickering
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Platts
Biggart	Granger	Porter
Bilbray	Graves	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Putnam
Blackburn	Heller	Radanovich
Blunt	Hensarling	Ramstad
Boehner	Herger	Regula
Bonner	Hobson	Rehberg
Bono	Hoekstra	Reichert
Boozman	Hulshof	Renzi
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Rohrabacher
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Burgess	Jordan	Royce
Calvert	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Saxton
Cannon	Kirk	Schmidt
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Knollenberg	Sessions
Carter	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Castle	LaHood	Shays
Chabot	Latham	Shimkus
Coble	LaTourette	Shuster
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Linder	Smith (TX)
Cubin	LoBiondo	Souder
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Stearns
Davis, David	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	E.	Tancred
Dent	Mack	Taylor
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Thornberry
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Drake	McCauley (TX)	Tiberi
Dreier	McCotter	Turner
Duncan	McCrery	Upton
Ehlers	McHenry	Walberg
Emerson	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Everett	McKeon	Walsh (NY)
Fallin	McMorris	Wamp
Feeney	Rodgers	Weldon (FL)
Ferguson	Mica	Westmoreland
Flake	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Wicker
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wilson (NM)
Fox	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Musgrave	Young (AK)
Galleghy	Neugebauer	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Alexander	Giffords	McDermott
Bachus	Gilchrest	Myrick
Burton (IN)	Hastert	Norwood
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Culberson	Higgins	Peterson (PA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Poe
Davis, Tom	Jones (OH)	Reynolds
English (PA)	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Farr	Lamborn	Stark
Fossella	Maloney (NY)	

□ 1323

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HINOJOSA changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEFazio). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. McHENRY. Under the new House rules, there is an anti-earmark rule that governs the House, which the rule governing this bill does not waive that rule of the House; and sections of this legislation actually go forward and vio-

late that anti-earmark legislation. Therefore, I rise to make a point of order against H.J. Res. 20, as title I, section 101(a)(2), violates rule XXI, clause 9, of the House rules, stating, “There shall be no Member-directed earmarks,” which this legislation does possess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply note that on page H988 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there is listed the following statement:

Under clause 9(a) of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits are submitted as follows offered by myself: H.J. Res. 20 making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

Mr. McHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. No.

Mr. McHENRY. The gentleman will not yield for the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On a point of order there is no yielding. The chair will hear each Member in turn. Does the gentleman from North Carolina wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. McHENRY. Yes. I wish to speak further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is stating, simply because legislation states that there are no earmarks, that you can contain thousands of earmarks after that statement. It defies logic and defies reason.

And, furthermore, your section explaining that there shall be no congressional earmarks is further on in the legislation. Therefore, it is not operational over the violation that I am stating in section 101. Therefore, under the legislation here, it is not operational. Therefore, it is a very crafty way, and I have got to compliment the gentleman for putting together a very crafty piece of legislation to try to slip this by. But under these House rules, this is a clear violation of the anti-earmarking provision that is very important to the rules of debate, even when the minority is not able to offer any amendments, even when the minority has no other means of removing congressional earmarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will restrict himself to the point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 9(a) of rule XXI, it is not in order to consider an unreported bill or joint resolution unless the chairman of each committee of initial referral has caused to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of congressional

earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits contained in the measure, or a statement that the measure contains no such earmarks or benefits.

Under clause 9(c) of rule XXI, a point of order under clause 9(a) of rule XXI may be based only on the failure of the submission to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include such a list or statement.

The Chair has examined the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and finds that it contains the statement contemplated by clause 9(a) of rule XXI.

Accordingly, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the appeal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Division. I ask for a division vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MCHENRY. Wait a second, Mr. Speaker. I asked for a division vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays have precedence over a request for a division.

The yeas and nays are requested. Those favoring a vote by the yeas and nays will rise. A sufficient number having risen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 184, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie	Cohen	Grijalva
Ackerman	Conyers	Gutierrez
Allen	Cooper	Hall (NY)
Altmire	Costa	Hare
Andrews	Costello	Harman
Arcuri	Courtney	Hastings (FL)
Baca	Cramer	Hereth
Baird	Crowley	Hill
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hinchey
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Hinojosa
Bean	Davis (CA)	Hirono
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hodes
Berkley	Davis, Lincoln	Holden
Berman	DeFazio	Holt
Berry	DeGette	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Delahunt	Hooley
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Dicks	Inslee
Boren	Dingell	Israel
Boswell	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Boyd (FL)	Donnelly	Jackson-Lee
Boyd (KS)	Doyle	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Jefferson
Braley (IA)	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	Emanuel	Jones (OH)
Capps	Engel	Kagen
Capuano	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Cardoza	Etheridge	Kaptur
Carnahan	Fattah	Kennedy
Carney	Filner	Kildee
Carson	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Castor	Giffords	Kind
Chandler	Gillibrand	Klein (FL)
Clarke	Gonzalez	Kucinich
Clay	Gordon	Lampson
Cleaver	Green, Al	Langevin
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lantos

Larsen (WA)	Napolitano	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Neal (MA)	Shuler
Lee	Oberstar	Simpson
Levin	Obey	Sires
Lewis (GA)	Olver	Slaughter
Lipinski	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
Loeb	Pallone	Snyder
Lofgren, Zoe	Pascarella	Solis
Lowey	Pastor	Space
Lynch	Payne	Spratt
Mahoney (FL)	Pelosi	Stupak
Markey	Perlmutter	Sutton
Marshall	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Matheson	Pomeroy	Tauscher
Matsui	Price (NC)	Taylor
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCollum (MN)	Ramstad	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Rangel	Tierney
McIntyre	Reyes	Towns
McNerney	Rodriguez	Udall (CO)
McNulty	Ross	Udall (NM)
Meehan	Rothman	Van Hollen
Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Melancon	Rush	Walz (MN)
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Millender-McDonald	Salazar	Schultz
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Watt
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Mitchell	Sarbanes	Weiner
Mollohan	Schakowsky	Welch (VT)
Moore (KS)	Schiff	Wexler
Moore (WI)	Schwartz	Wilson (OH)
Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Murphy (CT)	Scott (VA)	Wu
Murphy, Patrick	Serrano	Wynn
Murtha	Sestak	Yarmuth
Nadler	Shea-Porter	

NAYS—184

Aderholt	Fortenberry	McMorris
Akin	Fox	Rodgers
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Mica
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Gallagher	Miller (MI)
Bartlett (MD)	Garrett (NJ)	Miller, Gary
Barton (TX)	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Biggert	Gillmor	Murphy, Tim
Bilbray	Gingrey	Musgrave
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Goode	Nunes
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Pearce
Blunt	Granger	Pence
Boehner	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Bonner	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Boozman	Hayes	Pitts
Boustany	Heller	Platts
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Poe
Brown (SC)	Herger	Porter
Brown-Waite	Hobson	Price (GA)
Ginny	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Buchanan	Hulshof	Putnam
Burgess	Hunter	Radanovich
Burton (IN)	Inglis (SC)	Regula
Calvert	Issa	Rehberg
Camp (MI)	Jindal	Reichert
Campbell (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Renzi
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)
Cantor	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Capito	Keller	Rogers (MI)
Carter	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Castle	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Kirk	Roskam
Coble	Kline (MN)	Royce
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Kuhl (NY)	Sali
Crenshaw	LaHood	Saxton
Culberson	Lamborn	Schmidt
Davis (KY)	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Davis, David	LaTourette	Sessions
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Dent	Linder	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Doolittle	Lungren, Daniel E.	Smith (NJ)
Drake	Mack	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Manzullo	Souder
Duncan	Marchant	Stearns
Ehlers	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Emerson	McCotter	Tancredo
Everett	McCrery	Terry
Fallin	McHenry	Thornberry
Feeney	McHugh	Tiahrt
Ferguson	McKeon	Tiberi
Flake		Turner
Forbes		Upton

Walberg	Weller	Wilson (SC)
Walden (OR)	Westmoreland	Wolf
Walsh (NY)	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Wamp	Wicker	Young (FL)
Weldon (FL)	Wilson (NM)	

NOT VOTING—25

Alexander	Fossella	Myrick
Bachmann	Gilchrest	Norwood
Boucher	Hastert	Paul
Buyer	Higgins	Reynolds
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Skelton
Cummings	King (NY)	Stark
Davis, Jo Ann	Maloney (NY)	Watson
English (PA)	McCaul (TX)	
Farr	McDermott	

□ 1350

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DeFAZIO). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCHENRY. We just had a vote on this floor about rule XXI, section 9. Just for clarification, for the body's purposes going forward with this new rule, in essence, this is the parliamentary inquiry, if I may state it. The summary of rule XXI, section 9 is that as long as the legislation states that there are no earmarks, there may be thousands of earmarks within that legislation, but only operationally must the legislation include text that states that there are no earmarks. Is that the ruling of the Chair? I would be happy to give the Speaker numerous examples of earmarks in this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to hypothetical questions raised under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCHENRY. Further parliamentary inquiry then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCHENRY. Rule XXI, section 9, states that a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee, unless the report includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report and the name of any Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner who submits a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits. Does this legislation state that and conform to rule XXI, section 9?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair previously ruled on that question, and the House sustained the Chair by tabling an appeal.

Mr. MCHENRY. Further parliamentary inquiry. Operationally, may a committee Chair simply sign and attest to the Parliamentarian that there are no earmarks within said legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not render advisory opinions. That is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCHENRY. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have a proper parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MCHENRY. I appreciate the Speaker operating in such an unbiased way. It is very kind of you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will refrain for a moment, the Chair is operating under the precedents and rules of the House of Representatives and properly respecting those rules. So, if the gentleman has a proper parliamentary inquiry, he would please state it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. What is an earmark? Under House rules, what is an earmark?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has again not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Pursuant to House Resolution 116, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank Janet Airis and her staff at the CBO scoring unit; Ira Forstater and Nadia Soree and the entire staff at the Legislative Council; and certainly, most of all, the staff of the Appropriations Committee, both majority and minority, both Senate and House, especially Rob Nabors and David Reich.

This is a bill that needs to pass so that everyone who is reliant upon programs contained therein understands what the rules of the game will be for the remainder of the fiscal year. I urge passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to do something that I have never done before, and that is to oppose House passage of an appropriations bill.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, and I use the term "friends" sincerely, have produced an 8-month omnibus spending bill that appropriates \$463.5 billion. It is legislation that few have seen, which cannot be amended in any way, and that will pass this House after only 1 hour of debate. It is the first omnibus spending bill that I have seen during my time in Congress written and considered without the input of the chairman or ranking members of any appropriations subcommittee, without the input of any Republican or Democratic subcommittee members, without the benefit of a full Appropriations Committee markup, without the standard three days for circulating the

bill to committee members before markup, without the standard 3 days for circulating the bill to all House Members after full committee consideration, without any prior debate whatsoever, and without the opportunity to offer even one amendment on the House floor.

I do not fault my friend, Mr. OBEY, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for he is doing what he is asked to be done by his leadership. He is in the position today because of the former Senate majority leader's complete failure to schedule and pass the fiscal year 2007 appropriations bills. The House and the Senate Appropriations Committee did their work last year, and Mr. OBEY and I worked very closely in attempting to see it was fully completed. The Senate leadership did not.

As the former chairman of the committee, I know that Mr. OBEY feels strongly about maintaining regular order and passing other appropriations bills. I can vividly recall a conversation Mr. OBEY had with me shortly after I became chairman when he suggested that perhaps I would be the last chairman of the Appropriations Committee because of the breakdown of regular order.

I looked to his comments and have taken them to heart because I committed to him and to our Members that we would pass our spending bills in regular order, and the 2 years I served as chairman we did.

Today, my fear is that Mr. OBEY may be the last chairman of the Appropriations Committee because of the very concern he expressed to me, the breakdown of that regular order. Shutting both Republicans and Democrats out of the legislative process is a highly, highly unusual circumstance, but that is exactly what has occurred.

Both Republicans and Democrats are being denied a full and open debate on this legislation that will spend, as I suggested earlier, \$463.5 billion, roughly one-half of the annual Federal budget.

Speaker PELOSI and Leader HOYER, both former members of the Appropriations Committee, know that our process is very open and a collaborative one. Historically, appropriations bills are brought to the floor under an open rule to encourage debate and create better legislation. Our spending bills reflect not just the will of the Appropriations Committee but, indeed, the will of the entire bipartisan House. It is not uncommon to have hours and hours of debate and more than 100 Democrat or Republican amendments offered on a single spending bill. That is, until today.

The House will debate this legislation today for 1 hour. Not one amendment has been made in order. The Senate, that is, the other body, on the other hand, will have the opportunity to debate the legislation for up to 15 days and with the potential for an unlimited number of amendments.

□ 1400

Let me repeat, it is important that the Members hear that. One hour of debate in the House with no amendments, 15 days of debate in the Senate with potentially unlimited amendments.

Speaker PELOSI has vowed to run the House in a more open, democratic and inclusive way. A spirit of bipartisanship, she said, would prevail in the people's House. That pledge was put on the shelf so the new majority could complete their first 100 hours agenda.

The new majority then promised that business would soon return to regular order with plenty of opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to participate in the democratic process. Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans, are still waiting for the Speaker to keep her word.

In closing, I would suggest that our country would be better served by extending for a full year the clean continuing resolution the House and Senate passed in December. That legislation, a mere 19 pages long, contained no gimmicks, no policy changes, and did not reward or punish agencies indiscriminately, as is done in this 137-page package.

This omnibus spending bill before us today totally disregards the once proud tradition of regular order within the House Appropriations Committee and violates the longstanding bipartisan customs of the people's House. I urge that my colleagues join me in a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 which was signed by the President in August of 2005, included four directed spending programs that will each make a significant positive contribution to the security and reliability of the energy supply and infrastructure of this Nation. The Energy Policy Act authorized these programs with full funding so that they could be implemented as soon as possible. It should be made clear that it is the intent of the Continuing Resolution to remove any impediments that may have arisen to the timely implementation of the four Energy Policy Act provisions—Section 105, the Energy Saving Performance Contracts; Section 384, Coastal Impact Assistance; Section 999, Ultra-deepwater and Unconventional Onshore Natural Gas and Other Petroleum Research and Development; and Section 1211, Electric Reliability Organization. These programs were clearly authorized and directly funded by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and should be fully funded and implemented immediately.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the President will submit to the Congress his new budget. It would be kind of nice if we had disposed of his last year's budget request before the President brings

his new budget forward, because I believe that he is entitled to start the year with a clean slate, and I think we are entitled to start the year with a clean slate as well.

Unfortunately, we cannot do that because of the failures of the last Congress. This resolution represents the last remaining legislation that must be passed in order to clean up the mess left to us by the last Congress.

Now, we all know the story. Last year, the House debated and passed every single appropriation bill except the Labor, Health, Education bill. That was held up because of the now-well-known division between the two parties on the minimum wage and also because moderate Republicans in this House, led by people like Mr. CASTLE and others, were demanding that the Republican leadership add at least \$3 billion to the Labor, Health, Education appropriation bill in order to get their votes on the Republican budget resolution.

The then chairman, Mr. LEWIS from California, my good friend, specifically said on the House floor that the reason the Congress was not allowed to finish its work is because the Senate majority leader, Senator Frist, shielded the Senate from any painful votes on appropriations before the election. Then, after the election, the majority party walked away from their responsibility to finish the budget, and they left us to clean up the mess as they walked out the door.

When we considered the CR under which we are now operating, I specifically said from this place on the House floor that I would make any substantive compromise that was necessary and I would make any procedural compromise that was necessary in order to enable the then majority Republicans to finish the bills on their watch, on their terms. I said I was willing to recognize that they still controlled the Congress and so they had a right to have Republican priorities reflected in those bills, even if I disagreed with those priorities.

But I also warned that if they did not live up to their responsibilities to pass the budget, then they would forfeit their right to complain and whine about how we went about cleaning up their leftover jobs.

So when it became apparent that they would not meet their responsibilities, Senator BYRD and I announced that we would proceed by doing two things. We announced, first of all, that we would provide no congressional earmarks. We told anybody who had an earmark in a 2007 bill that if they wanted it considered in the following fiscal year they would need to present it under the reform process, which we were in the process of putting together; and we announced at that time that we intended to cut earmarks by 50 percent in comparison to the 2007 bill.

The second thing that we announced is that we would take the 2006 continuing resolution and make whatever

adjustments were necessary in order to avoid shutdowns of agencies or layoffs or furloughs and in order to recognize priorities that we thought people had on both sides of the aisle. That is what we did.

In this bill, we started with the fiscal 2006 base. We then cut or rescinded \$9- to \$10 billion, almost \$10 billion, in items that we thought could be cut or rescinded. We cut over 60 programs. We generated \$10 billion or so in savings, and we added that to the \$7 billion that still remained within the Republican budget resolution cap, and then we allocated that money on the basis of what we thought were better priorities.

Now, the gentleman from California says we should have just stuck with the existing 2006 continuing resolution. We could have done that. If we had, we would not have been able to add \$3.6 billion in veterans' health care, which we have done in this bill, which is our number one priority. We would not have been able to add \$1.2 billion in defense health, which we add in this bill. We would not have been able to add \$500 million for basic housing allowances for our military, and we would not have been able to add the \$1 billion that we added for BRAC, the base closing operations. We would also not have been able to add the \$216 million that we added to the FBI budget at the request of the administration.

In education, two weeks ago, when the Democratic Party brought to this House floor a proposition to lower interest rates on student loans, we were told, "oh, that is just tokenism. What you ought to do is add to the Pell Grants."

That is what we have done. We added enough to the Pell Grant program to allow an increase in the maximum grant of \$260. We wouldn't have been able to do that either if we had followed Mr. LEWIS' suggestion and simply stuck to the CR under which we are now operating.

In addition to that, we added \$250 million to Title I and \$100 million to Head Start so we could end the decline in enrollment in that program.

In the area of science, we were asked by a number of Members on the Republican side of the aisle in this House, and on our side, plus the Senate on both sides, to add money for NIH. Members did not like the fact that, under the alternative, we were going to lose at least 500 medical grants in cancer research, heart disease, Alzheimer's and the rest.

I have not met a single constituent who said, "Hey, OBEY, I think you ought to save money by cutting cancer research grants." We added \$620 million to reverse the decline in the number of research grants at NIH, and we added some additional funds to the National Science Foundation.

We added some additional money to energy conservation and energy research programs, in addition to which we provided a \$200 million add-on for the Clean Water Revolving Fund. There

isn't a small community in this country that doesn't need some help with clean water.

We added \$100 million for park maintenance, and we added \$90 million for firefighting.

We also were requested by the administration to provide at least the amount that they asked for the global AIDS program and to combat malaria and TB. So we added \$1.4 billion to do that, and we added \$146 million to prevent the Social Security Administration from having a 10-day furlough for their employees. That is what we did.

We also provided a suspension of all earmarks.

Now, I want to make clear a lot of the earmarks that we suspended are perfectly defensible. They accomplish laudatory public purposes. I think it is sad that we haven't been able to fund them. But the fact is that it became apparent to me that the earmarking process had been so discredited by the Cunningham case and by other cases that we have no choice but to start over. So we wanted to clear the decks, clean up the process, and start over.

Ninety-nine percent of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle have immense integrity. They don't ask the Congress for things that are illegitimate, but it is that 1 percent that has fouled the nest for everybody else. So we are trying to clean up the nest so that we can approach next year with a clean start and so that we will have a process so that both parties will know what earmarks the other party is putting into the bills.

I want the minority to be fully cognizant of whatever earmarks the majority puts in the bills, and I want us to be fully cognizant of the other earmarks you put in the bills. That is the only way we can protect the integrity of this institution.

So we are being criticized in some quarters because we are being told, "Well, when you eliminated the earmarks, you should also have eliminated the money in those programs." We didn't do that for one very simple reason. We didn't want to reduce the amount of money in the COPS program, for instance.

What we are doing, by eliminating earmarks, and let's be clear about it, we are not saving a dime by eliminating earmarks. But what we are doing is transferring the power to decide where that money goes from the congressional branch to the executive branch. I don't like that, but it is a price I am willing to pay to clean up the system. What that means is that the administration will have much more authority than normal to decide where money goes, whether it is in the Army Corps of Engineers program or COPS or you name it.

I would simply say, we may have made some wrong choices. Undoubtedly, we did. But the process was this.

For 3½ weeks our staffs worked 7 days a week round the clock, and they negotiated with the Senate, Republican

and Democratic staff alike. The Republican staff was invited to every meeting that took place. If they attended or didn't, that was up to them.

Whenever the staff could not reach agreement, the Members were brought in order to argue it up. If you don't think that occurred, talk to Mr. VISCLOSKEY, talk to Senator DOMENICI, talk about the arguments they had on the Energy and Water bill, and there are countless other examples.

We are now in a situation in which we have to move on. We may have made some wrong choices, but at least, in contrast to last year, we made those choices, we made them. They may not be popular, but they were necessary so that we can turn the page, get on the next year.

This bill is the functional equivalent of a conference report. All of the appropriation bills that were not completed action on last year, this is what they look like. This is what they look like. This is a continuing resolution that we are producing today in order to direct where the spending in these bills ought to go.

Now, you may say you don't think it fits the traditional definition of a continuing resolution. Either you can have an automatic continuing resolution, or you can have a thinking man's continuing resolution. I don't think that we were obligated to lock ourselves into the 2006 numbers, because that would have prevented us from providing the initiatives that I talked about for veterans, for education and the like.

This is a responsible document. Nothing was sneaked in. Everybody knows what is in this package. All the staff knows.

I would urge an "aye" vote for the bill so that, come Monday, we can deal with the President's new budget, rather than continuing to deal with the spilt milk of yesterday's majority.

□ 1415

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee of Appropriations (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that this is a sad day for the U.S. House.

Why do I say that? Well, Mr. Speaker, the power of the purse is the most important power of the Congress. James Madison called the power of the purse "the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people."

The power of the purse of the Congress is exercised through its Appropriations Committee and the appropriations process that is longstanding in this body.

Today, we are throwing out that procedure. We are saying in this bill that all of the work that has gone on in the hearings, hundreds of hearings, hours and hundreds of hours of testimony

that we have taken in the various subcommittee hearings from the administration, from outside witnesses, from Members of Congress, the Senate and so on, all of those hearings are being disregarded and thrown out. The testimony from the agency and the department heads and the Inspectors General and all of the people that are in the executive branch that are in charge of keeping track of the money, the GAO reports, budget reports, policy expert reports, all of those are being tossed out in favor of the judgment of two Members of the Congress, one from the House, one from the Senate. The bill before us is the product of two people, one from the House, one from the Senate.

All of the debate that took place on the House floor on these individual bills as they came before this body, and Members expressed their views, offered amendments, had some won, some lost, but nevertheless, the process worked. That is being thrown out.

These bills were chock full of reporting requirements of oversight provisions, congressional controls, money closely tied to results from the administration. The bills were carefully crafted in an open process, input from every Member, and all 10 of the 11 bills passed through the House gained widespread bipartisan support. Legislation we can be proud of. And yet we are throwing that out.

The bipartisan work, we are throwing it away. This annual process we call the appropriations process is being discarded. We are cutting the purse strings, blindly handing over the money to the executive branch with no leverage, no new oversight of nearly half of the Federal discretionary budget.

The new majority, Mr. Speaker, has been very righteous in saying it will conduct much more oversight than the previous Congress. And yet this so-called CR completely abdicates the majority's responsibilities as conducting any oversight. Just give the money to the executive branch. Spend it as you please. We don't care. That is what we are saying.

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't like it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks about how we should have stuck with the bills that they produced last year. There is only one problem. They couldn't convince their Republican brethren in the Senate to buy them. And so we had to try something else.

I can't help it that the majority party did not meet its responsibilities to pass these appropriations because you had an internal fight within the Republican Party. But now the responsibility is passed to us, and at least we are producing a proposal which can pass both Houses. That is more than can be said for the work product of the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the term "abdication of responsibility" used. I consider abdication of responsibility only passing two out of 13 appropriation bills last year.

Today is a good day for America's veterans. As someone who has fought hard for veterans over the years, I want to applaud Chairman OBEY and Democratic leaders for placing such a high priority on veterans in this resolution. It is the right thing to do. Our veterans fought for our country, and now it is time for us to stand up for them.

Unfortunately, though, since October 1 of last year, for the last 4 months, VA health care has been woefully underfunded. Why? Because those who are arguing against this resolution today failed to pass for the entire year the 2007 VA appropriations bill when they were in charge of this House and the other body, continued underfunding that put veterans health care seriously at risk.

VA medical care in this resolution has increased by \$3.6 billion. That means \$300 million each month once this resolution becomes law, helping to provide better health care for our men and women who have served our country.

Let me personalize what those numbers mean to our veterans. Without the vital funding increase in this resolution, millions of veterans could see their health care services reduced. Hundreds of thousands of veterans could have to wait in line longer, perhaps months longer, to get the medical services they need and they deserve. Tens of thousands of veterans might not even receive any medical care at all from the VA without this resolution.

A vote for this resolution is a vote to respect our veterans. It says we will not only respect our veterans with our words. We will respect them with our deeds. Our veterans deserve no less. Vote "yes" for our veterans by voting "yes" for this resolution.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEWIS for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the resolution. And let me just stipulate it probably has a lot of very good things in it. But when I was chairman of two different subcommittees, we always had complete consultation, and if what I am saying is not accurate, those Members should come down here and attack me for it, complete consultation before we sent the bills out. And what I am concerned about is the precedent that we are establishing.

I have a resolution to put the Congress on record in support of the Iraq Study Group. Now, am I going to be foreclosed from offering that resolution? Here is a group of men and women, Baker and Hamilton, who spent 8 months. It was one of these evil earmarks that you hear all about it. Am I going to be foreclosed from offering the Baker-Hamilton solution to the

problem? The administration doesn't like it. Probably Members on both sides of the aisle don't like it. But am I going to be foreclosed? Here is a group that spent 8 months looking at this. And Jim Baker is a good man and Lee Hamilton is a good man. They were bipartisan. Chuck Robb; Bill Perry; Leon Panetta, who served over here; and Ed Meese. Based on what we are seeing here now, I will be foreclosed. Any resolution that comes from this side of the aisle is automatically foreclosed. We have watched it for the whole month of January.

So let me just say I am sure, Mr. OBEY, this is probably a lot of good stuff. But we on the minority side have to be treated the way we should be. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Now, the test will be with my resolution, and there are only two of us on it, GILCHREST and myself. Will I be foreclosed by the Rules Committee in 2 weeks from my resolution that puts the Congress on record in support of the Baker-Hamilton Commission? Ten people, five Republicans, five Democrats, spent more time looking at this issue of Iraq than this Congress has, than the Republican Party has and the Democratic Party has. And based on what is taking place so far today, I will be foreclosed.

And I hope I am not foreclosed because when you are in the minority and you don't have that opportunity to offer amendments, then, frankly, you are being cut out of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

This is a continuing resolution like no other that I have seen before. It is an omnibus appropriations bill that will fund nearly one-half of the federal government for fiscal year 2007.

When I was Chairman of the Science, State, Justice Subcommittee, we had in-depth discussions and consultations with our Ranking and minority members. On our committee we worked in a bi-partisan manner. The precedent that this CR is setting troubles me.

I have a resolution supporting the recommendations of the recently released Iraq Study Group, also known as the Baker-Hamilton report.

Based on this CR process with its closed rule and no committee debate, does this mean that I am going to be foreclosed from offering the resolution?

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been quoted saying that most of the negotiations on the CR were conducted by staff. While we have terrific staff on both sides of the aisle, this is not the way this institution is supposed to operate.

The resolution before the House includes \$31.2 billion for the State, Foreign Operations accounts.

This is an increase of \$1 billion dollars over the Fiscal Year 2006 level.

I am in no way criticizing the Gentlelady from New York, but I did not meet with the chairwoman of the subcommittee to discuss the CR. I know she is fair and reaches out across the aisle, and perhaps her hands were tied in this unfair process.

To be candid, there are some positive aspects of the State, Foreign Operations chap-

ter. One is the full funding of the president's request for Global HIV/AIDS. This funding will provide life saving drugs to thousands of people infected with HIV/AIDS and will meet President Bush's goal of treating 2 million people, preventing 7 million new infections, and caring for 10 million people by 2009.

In addition, another \$50 million is provided for the African Union's Mission in Sudan, and another \$113 million for United Nations' international peacekeeping.

But, these funding increases had to result in decreases elsewhere. The president's 2007 Budget request included \$3.2 billion for the Economic Support Fund, the continuing resolution cuts \$746 million from the request, and is \$148 million below the 2006 enacted level. A reduction of this magnitude will affect the Administration's ability to carry out critical foreign policy priorities, including democracy, infrastructure, and economic development programs in Iraq.

The president's 2007 Request included an increase of \$709 million for stability and reconstruction programs in Iraq, these programs are essential to improving the safety of our troops in the country. Yet, the majority directed that there be no mention of funding for anything related to Iraq in the resolution.

This process is not the way the House's business should be conducted. I urge members to vote against this measure to make a statement about the way this entire process has been handled.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my good friend, my colleague, Mr. WOLF, I look forward to working closely with you. And as you may know, or I am surprised if you don't know, my staff was working with your staff every single step of the way, and your input and the input of your staff was invaluable. So we can have further discussions. Thank you very much.

And I want to commend Chairman OBEY and all the staff on both sides of the aisle, because we worked on the bill together, for their tireless work.

It is a shame, frankly, that the Republican leadership of the 109th Congress failed to finish its work on the fiscal year 2007 appropriations bills, leaving vital programs in the lurch.

And while this bill is the result of the Republicans' abdication of duty in the 109th Congress, it is a fair, balanced, and bipartisan attempt to continue essential government programs and services and address critical priorities.

Specifically, this joint resolution provides a total of \$4.55 billion for global HIV/AIDS and TB, almost \$300 million above the President's fiscal year 2007 request, including \$724 million for the Global Fund. We have also increased PEPFAR funding by \$75 million over the President's request to put hundreds of thousands more people on lifesaving medications.

In addition to keeping the momentum in our HIV/AIDS initiatives, the joint resolution also addresses the ongoing genocide in Darfur, Sudan. Two-and-a-half years after Congress de-

clared the atrocities to be genocide, violence continues unabated. This bill provides \$50 million in additional funds for the only peacekeepers on the ground, the African Union forces.

Additionally, this bill meets our commitment for Israel and Egypt as requested for fiscal year 2007.

And, finally, having just returned from Afghanistan, I do believe there is still a glimmer of hope that our assistance can make a positive impact there. I am pleased that the joint resolution provides over \$1 billion for reconstruction programs, counternarcotics and other priorities. And I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this joint resolution.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of our Transportation Subcommittee of Appropriations (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 20 as it is currently written.

The CR includes authorization language that will change the formula for distributing section 8 housing assistance that will cut funding from 31 States and 1,227 PHAs, permanently.

I make no bones about this. Both in my State of Michigan, in Detroit and in Pontiac, PHAs in the State of Michigan as a whole would be severely impacted by the language in this bill. But I am just one of many Members, 31 States, who are impacted by this legislation, by this bill.

I ask why are we doing this now? There is no need to make the change now. There is no urgent situation that needs fixing. Under the current system, every PHA would have received an increase that fully covers the cost of running their section 8 program. No one gets cut; no one gets hurt.

This language has one impact. It creates instability and uncertainty by creating a new set of winners and losers every year.

And in their very first budget, the new majority would cut \$460 million for 1,227 PHAs from what would have been provided if the program had been left alone. A complete list of the PHAs being impacted has been made available for all Members to review.

And this is not a one-time sweep, by the way, of so-called excess funds. The losses being imposed on the PHAs with this language are permanent losses, not just for this year.

This is not the system that we worked so hard to develop. Where stability and uncertainty has been the order of the day, we are now having disruption and uncertainty.

The principal claim by the supporters of this provision is that there are excess funds in PHAs that can be redistributed to other entities so that more families can be served. But that is not what the people who run the program say. Of the nearly \$29 billion in funds that has been provided to the PHAs over the last 2 years, only 2.5 percent is

actually deemed excess. Two-and-a-half percent. That hardly seems like a crisis to me.

□ 1430

To take away those funds permanently from those areas and the families that could be served is not the solution. Getting the funds spent on families in those areas by those PHAs is the right solution.

It is clear from the language in the bill that the majority has no real certainty on what this provision is going to do. They have set aside \$100 million of the funds for unanticipated outcomes. But there will be no doubt about the outcome, and \$100 million is a drop in the bucket.

Again, according to the Department, the top 10 PHAs, including New York City, L.A. County, L.A. City, Sacramento, Dallas, Cook County, Miami/Dade, and San Diego County, will be cut \$132 million alone; and that leaves \$328 million, or 70 percent, of the destruction being caused in smaller PHAs throughout the country untouched.

Finally, the majority has argued that the administration is proposing the same change in 2008 and 2009. No one has seen the HUD budget. We have very conflicting information coming through. Regardless of what is wrong, I would urge all Members on both sides of the aisle with those PHAs that will be impacted like mine, 31, I strongly suggest they look at all of these losses; and I strongly oppose this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support provisions in this resolution that provide funding for roads and transit, Pell Grants, Special Education, NCLB, veterans' healthcare and scientific research at places like NIH and Argonne National Laboratory.

However, I do not support a provision in this bill that will slash housing assistance for hundreds of families and seniors in my district and for thousands more nationwide.

It is unfortunate that the leadership and appropriators on the other side of the aisle decided that it was OK to completely rewrite the funding formula for the disbursement of Section 8 housing funds in this bill without consulting with the authorizing committee, Financial Services. The last time I checked, authorizing on an appropriations bill is against the House rules. But of course, the rule for this bill denies us any opportunity to raise a point of order, or amend the bill. At least during previous Republican-led Congresses, our leadership had the courtesy to allow Democrats to offer amendments and points of order and followed rules that reflect a truly democratic process.

Now, I must point out that the other side of the aisle still has a chance to do this the right way. As the new Ranking Member of the Financial Services Housing Subcommittee, I am

perfectly happy to work with the majority to craft a comprehensive, bipartisan Section 8 reform package that will provide stability and predictability for our public housing authorities and those whom they serve.

My constituents are not well served by this abrupt and drastic change in the formula, and I would warn my colleagues from Illinois to look closely at the new numbers for their districts.

The Chicago suburbs are hit hard by this new formula. Each housing authority in all three counties of my Congressional district will receive a funding cut this year. The housing authority in Cook County will lose \$8 million, Joliet will lose \$1.1 million, Aurora and DuPage County will lose over a million dollars.

These are not just dollars; these are families and seniors who are being hurt here. With this bill's proposed cuts to Section 8 housing funding, more than 100 families in DuPage County, about 150 in Will County, and thousands across the country will be kicked to the curb in 2007. This is unacceptable.

I am disappointed by the thoughtlessness of those on the other side of the aisle who determined the new formula and numbers in this bill. I urge my colleagues to alert their constituents who will become homeless this year about this fly-by-night formula change that our dear colleagues have brought to the floor today. I invite the Democratic leadership to explain to the neediest citizens in the suburbs of Chicago and in communities across our Nation why they won't have a roof over their heads in 2007. This is no way to start the New Year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12 minutes. The gentleman from California has 16.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution includes important increases above the fiscal year 2006 level for programs that are truly necessary in our Commerce Justice Appropriations Subcommittee. I appreciate the inclusion of increased funding for FBI counterterrorism and intelligence and for the cost of conducting a timely and accurate focus on our next census.

Also included are important increases for basic scientific research, an additional \$335 million for the National Science Foundation research, which will set the groundwork for new technologies that will spark innovation and ensure our competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned, however, about funding for drug enforcement. Funding is included in this resolution to maintain the current rate of operations for every Department of Justice entity except the Drug Enforcement Agency. The funding for the DEA will result in a loss of over 160 agents and deep cuts to the Mobile Enforcement Team program, the DEA's primary tool to fight meth and violent drug crime at the State and municipal levels.

With violent crime on the rise and many communities dealing with meth-

amphetamine, that crisis, this is the wrong time to retreat on funding for the DEA. For this and many other reasons I rise to oppose this resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when I hear some of my Republican colleagues leap to the defense of section 8, I can only compare that to learning that Ahmadinejad had applied for membership in B'nai Brith. We have been trying to defend section 8 against assault for some time.

One form of the assault has been formulaic rules that prevent all of the money that is appropriated from being spent. Because there is a lot of support for section 8, the administration has been unhappy when we have voted here more money than they have asked for. So they have had a series of formulaic restrictions that keep us from getting it all spent.

I will note, by the way, that the particular change here that the committee has recommended is supported by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, and the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association. That is, all of those who administer section 8 through their organizations endorse it.

Here is the way it has worked. There were formulas put in there that kept some agencies from spending money which they received. That is, many agencies were given money that could not be spent and had not been spent that came out of the hide of agencies that needed to spend more. What this bill does is to make sure that every appropriation is spent; and as to those agencies that might be losing an allocation, in every case they are losing money that they had not been able to spend because they did not have the legal authority to do it.

This bill guarantees, and we will be here to make good on that guarantee, that any agencies that can say, well, we are not getting the same allocation that we got before, they will have reserves available to them on which they can draw. So we can guarantee that no one will be unable to serve everyone they are now serving.

What it does mean is that money which this formula has prevented from being spent in some agencies will now be spent. We will not give some agencies more than they can spend and some less. We will even it out.

And I stress again that the reserves will be available, and that is why every one of the agencies in this country that spends money on section 8, all of the public housing authorities have explicitly supported this particular change.

COUNCIL OF LARGE PUBLIC HOUSING
AUTHORITIES,
Washington, DC, January 31, 2007.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
*Chairman, House of Representatives, Committee
on Appropriations, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Council of Large Public Housing Authorities (CLPHA) represents 60 of the nation's largest housing authorities that own and manage 40 percent of the nation's public housing and administer over 30 percent of the Housing Choice Voucher program. We are writing to support the FY 2007 Joint Resolution in the House of Representatives.

CLPHA greatly appreciates the inclusion of an additional \$300 million for Public Housing Operating Fund in the legislation and the \$487 million increase in the Housing Choice Voucher account. The increase in operating funds is a good start in addressing the chronic under-funding of public housing programs. Public housing is still significantly under-funded and we look forward to working with Congress to provide full funding for public housing.

CLPHA commends the House for unraveling the complicated and inefficient funding system HUD has imposed on housing authorities since 2004. By adopting a formula that bases funding on the most recent 12 months of leasing and cost data the House action will guarantee funding for all vouchers in use. The increase in funds, combined with the change in how these funds are distributed ensure that housing authorities do not have to reduce the number of families they currently serve.

However, in order to effectively transition to this new formula, housing authorities need access to currently allocated funds to help them to offset losses and to increase leasing levels in their communities. Congress must protect these funds and prohibit HUD from recapturing them for either punitive reasons or to meet a rescission target.

Thank you again for supporting public and assisted housing programs. We look forward to working with you on these most important issues.

Sincerely,

SUNIA ZATERMAN,
Executive Director.

PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITIES
DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 31, 2007.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
*Chairman, House of Representatives, Committee
on Appropriations, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: PHADA represents the professional administrators of almost 1,900 local housing authorities from all over the United States. I am writing in regard to the FY 2007 Joint Resolution the House of Representatives will soon consider.

PHADA supports and appreciates the inclusion of \$300 million more in operating funds included in the legislation. The summary accompanying the resolution notes that this increase still leaves HAs with a significant shortfall in FY 2007. Still, the measure is a welcome step in the right direction. PHADA wants to work with you and your Senate colleagues on future efforts to bring public housing funding up to more adequate levels.

PHADA also supports the Housing Choice Voice (HCV) funding and formula in the legislation. The association has long supported a more rational voucher formula based on actual leasing and voucher costs. Your bill establishes the inception of such a policy. Recent experience demonstrates that the Bush Administration's "snapshot" voucher formula has not been successful. Inefficiencies in that formula have over-funded some housing agencies and underfunded others.

Moving to a formula based on actual voucher lease up and costs distributes funding to agencies as it is actually being used and thus guarantees funding for all vouchers in use. Importantly, the bill also includes \$100 million to protect housing agencies and residents that might otherwise be harmed during the transition to the new formula.

Thank you again for your support of public and assisted housing programs. PHADA looks forward to working with you on the implementation of this legislation and during the FY 2008 budget process that begins next week.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY G. KAISER,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING
AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS,
Washington DC, January 31, 2007.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOHN OLVER,
*Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee
on Transportation, HUD, and Related
Agencies, Washington, DC.*

Hon. JERRY LEWIS,
*Ranking Member, House Committee on Appro-
priations, Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOSEPH KNOLENBERG,
*Ranking Member, House Appropriations Sub-
committee on Transportation, HUD, and Re-
lated Agencies, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS: I am writing to express the strong support of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) for the Section 8 Tenant-Based Rental Assistance voucher-renewal formula included in H. J. Res. 20. Formed in 1933, with more than 22,000 agency and individual members, NAHRO is the nation's oldest and largest nonprofit organization composed of local agencies and officials engaged in creating and maintaining affordable housing opportunities. NAHRO members are responsible for administering more than 80 percent of all Section 8 Housing Choice vouchers.

This revision to the voucher distributional formula is a long-overdue correction of a policy that has simply proven not to work. Prior to the adoption of the current law policy in 2004, the voucher program was highly successful in serving families it was charged to assist. The funding policies in place provided the incentives and stability necessary for agencies to efficiently administer the program.

Since the current law formula was instituted in 2004, this highly-successful program has lost well over 100,000 vouchers, and by some estimates are as many as 150,000 vouchers, due to inefficiencies in the formula. In contrast, H. J. Res. 20 will provide all agencies sufficient funding to continue assisting the same number of families served in FY 2006, and some may be able to make some progress toward restoring lost vouchers.

INEFFICIENCY OF CURRENT FORMULA LED TO LOSS OF VOUCHERS

Newspapers across the country have chronicled the numbers of families whose assistance was abruptly terminated or denied, dismissed from waiting lists, or for whom rent burdens have increased since 2004. The loss of assistance for these tens of thousands of families has not been due to a shortage of funding provided by Congress. In fact, Congress appropriated sufficient funding each year to support these families.

These dramatic losses are, in fact, due to the inefficiency of the formula in place since 2004. The current formula bases funding to each agency upon an outdated and unrepresentative "snapshot" of data from three

months in 2004. As a result, it has distributed more money to some agencies than necessary to serve 100 percent of their authorized families, while at the same time, deeply cutting other agencies, forcing them to reduce the number of families served. The depth of the inefficiency has grown with time.

H J RES. 20 MAKES MORE EFFICIENT USE OF AVAILABLE FUNDS

The revised formula contained in H J Res. 20, as written, will ensure that all public housing agencies will receive at least the amount necessary to serve the number of families served in their voucher programs in 2006, plus inflation. These agencies will not lose funding needed to maintain their programs at the levels existing in 2006, and some may be able to make progress in restoring lost vouchers. In addition, agencies have access to a \$100 million adjustment pool for any agency that has increased need due to unforeseen circumstances or any hardship caused by the transition to the new formula.

The net result is a more accurate formula than the one in use from 2004 through 2006. This formula will utilize the funding provided more efficiently than the previous formula, assisting a larger number of families with the appropriated amounts than would occur under the previous formula.

FOCUS MUST BE ON SERVING THE GREATEST NUMBER OF FAMILIES WITH DOLLARS PROVIDED

Detractors opposing formula revision have unfortunately relied on data that provides a misleading picture of the impact of the revised formula. This is because the data focus solely on the amounts distributed to each community rather than on the efficiency with which those dollars will be used to serve eligible families. Because the current formula is based on outdated "snapshot" information, much of the funding cited as a "net loss" under the H J Res. 20 formula is actually in excess of the amounts needed to serve 100 percent of those agencies' authorized families in 2007. These are funds that would be distributed but could not be used by agencies to serve families if the present formula were retained. Therefore, the data do not provide an accurate picture of the families served by those dollars, the most important measure of success for this program.

The agency-by-agency listing in the data does not show the half of all agencies who receive less funding under the current formula than under H J Res. 20. For these agencies, the consequences of loss of dollars under the current formula will have a real and severe impact on the number of families they can serve. The H J Res. 20 formula is based on the amount necessary to continue serving the number of families presently assisted. Failing to enact it would mean that these agencies will not receive the funds necessary to serve families in place last year and perhaps make some progress in restoring lost vouchers.

We do not dispute that there is much unmet need for housing assistance across the country. However, providing some agencies with funding above 100 percent of their authorized vouchers while others continue to lose assistance for families in place last year is not a sound national policy. Instead, it is an inefficient use of taxpayers' dollars that needlessly leaves thousands of families unassisted.

In sum, we congratulate you on your willingness to correct in this voucher funding policy. Repairing the damage done to this program over the past three years will take time. The funding policy provided by H J Res. 20 is a good step in that direction. With continued funding support from Congress for both vouchers and the administrative funds necessary to help families find housing, and

efficient funding policies, we can set this critical program back on its former path of success and restore the number of vouchers lost in recent years.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this information

Sincerely,

SAUL N. RAMIREZ, Jr.,
Executive Director.

CENTER ON BUDGET AND
POLICY PRIORITIES,

Washington, DC, January 30, 2007.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,

*Chair, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OBEY: I am writing to state our strong support for the provisions relating to "Section 8" Housing Choice Vouchers in H.J. Res. 20, the Joint Funding Resolution for Fiscal Year 2007.

Section 8 vouchers are the leading source of federal housing assistance, and provide access to affordable housing for approximately two million low-income households, including working families with children, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

H.J. Res. 20 fully funds the President's request for voucher renewals, by providing the \$487 million above the FY 2006 level that the President has said is needed to maintain the program. In a bill where resources were very constrained, this is a notable achievement.

Even more important, however, the bill makes a badly needed change in the formula used to allocate funding among the 2400 state and local housing agencies that administer the voucher program. For the past three years, voucher funding has been distributed under a highly flawed and inefficient formula. This formula relies on outdated data about housing trends, and has been providing many agencies with more funds than they can use, while others have had to make significant cuts. In all, a staggering 150,000 vouchers have been lost since 2004.

H.J. Res. 20 would ensure that the funding for each voucher in use in 2006 is renewed, by basing agencies' funding on their actual leasing rates and costs in the prior year. This simple but critical reform would stem the tide of voucher cuts, and restore badly needed stability to the program, at no additional cost to the federal government. By contrast, had the formula not been altered, thousands of vouchers in use in 2006 would have been in jeopardy.

I commend you and Members of the Committee for including this provision in the bill, and would urge others to support your efforts.

Sincerely,

ROBERT GREENSTEIN,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL LOW INCOME
HOUSING COALITION,

Washington, DC, January 31, 2007.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Low Income Housing Coalition urges you to support H.J. Res. 20, the joint funding resolution that will fund the federal government for the remainder of FY07. The bill provides necessary program increases and policy changes to critical low income housing programs.

In particular, I want to call to your attention the provisions that will make important improvements to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's housing choice voucher program.

In 2004, HUD and Congress changed the formula for distribution of housing choice voucher funds to the 2600 public housing agencies that manage the program. This was done as a cost-cutting measure. Unfortunately, this change resulted in a system that has proved to be inefficient and wasteful, while at the same time reducing the number of vouchers available to many communities.

Under this new distribution formula, many public housing authorities were forced to reduce the number of families that were served by vouchers. As a result, there has been a loss of 150,000 vouchers since 2004, which could have assisted the large number of families on waiting lists for affordable housing across the country. At the same time, some public housing agencies received funding allocations that were higher than their funding needs and these funds went unused.

Congress has the opportunity to remedy this problem by adopting the new formula included in H.J. Res. 20. In 2006, this formula was included in legislation (H.R. 5443) approved by the House Financial Service Committee and in the Senate FY07 Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

The change allocates funding in FY07 based on each housing agency's most recent twelve month period of voucher leasing and cost data, rather than a three-month snapshot in 2004 that is current measure. The National Low Income Housing Coalition strongly supports this formula change.

We also thank the appropriators for including the President's FY07 request for voucher funding in the joint funding resolution. If both the formula change and the funding increase are enacted, no public housing authority will have to make cuts to their voucher programs in 2007.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

SHEILA CROWLEY, MSW, PhD.,
President and CEO.

NATIONAL LEASED HOUSING
ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, January 31, 2007.

Hon. JOHN W. OLVER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OLVER: The members of the National Leased Housing Association have reviewed Joint Resolution 20 with regard to funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and are writing to share our perspectives on the Section 8 programs.

First, we commend both the House and Senate for their efforts to provide adequate funding for the "Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher" program and for the renewals of Section 8 project-based contracts. These programs are critical to the provision of affordable housing to 3.5 million households. We are also pleased that the Joint Resolution addressed the expiration of HUD's restructuring authority under the Mark to Market program.

Further, we applaud you for addressing how vouchers are allocated to local communities. We believe that the approach taken in the Joint Resolution, which bases agencies' budgets on their leasing costs from the most recent 12 months, is sound and will lead to the most efficient and stable results for recipients, administrators, owners and other stakeholders. In the last three years, we have learned through experience that basing voucher funding on outdated information from a potentially unrepresentative three-month period, leaves many housing agencies without the resources needed to meet current commitments.

In addition, the rigid funding formula of the past few years have left current voucher holders vulnerable; minimized the ability of PHAs to utilize the vouchers authorized by Congress; exacerbated concerns that it is not prudent to lend or invest private capital in affordable housing; reduced housing choice for voucher holders; and inhibited new construction and rehabilitation of additional low income units.

By allocating funding based on the realities of the local marketplace, the Joint Res-

olution formula will avoid these problems, and ensure that scarce federal resources are directed where they are most needed to support current commitments.

Sincerely,

DENISE B. MUHA,
Executive Director.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill before us eliminates \$3.1 billion that would support the plan, approved by this Congress, to reposition our military forces throughout the world, a plan that is integral to our strategy to win the war on terror.

The cut in funding of over \$3 billion has been termed devastating by Army officials. It eliminates the support for our military and their families, may I remind us, in a time of war.

Let me give you a specific example. Fourteen thousand troops and their families, including 4,000 children, are scheduled to reposition from Germany back to the States. Cutting funding for support for this plan leaves our senior military leaders with the Hobson's choice of either moving just a few units or moving our servicemembers and their families on the bases with inadequate infrastructure and training facilities.

It prevents soldiers from having the type of training facilities they need to prepare for war. It will create an uncertainty about whether their children are able to attend adequate schools. It puts in jeopardy medical treatment facilities that our military members and their families deserve access to and can force our troops into temporary housing.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. Are we willing to cut support for those who fight this war? I say no, and I will vote "no." This bill shortchanges our troops and their families and inhibits our ability to train and prepare our troops and our Nation for future attacks.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, it is not correct that we are cutting BRAC. We are increasing BRAC \$1 billion above the existing levels in the continuing resolution under which we are operating today. We will deal with the additional requests for BRAC in the supplemental, and you can bet that they will get all of their money. But we are adding \$1 billion to BRAC. We are not cutting.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, we would not be in this unfortunate situation if our colleagues in the Senate had actually passed their bill. The House fulfilled its appropriation responsibilities; the other body did not.

I have no problem with my majority colleague on the subcommittee, the distinguished chairman from Indiana. He has involved the minority in the process, treated us fairly, and attempted to protect our interests.

Unfortunately, the ground rules established to this resolution disadvantage the House greatly in the negotiations with the Senate. The process adopted by the majority has undermined the ability of the subcommittee to negotiate a good CR and strip out Senate pork. There are a number of significant funding reductions that should have been taken in the CR that were not.

Again, I have no fault with my chairman. He tried. But the Senate balked at even citing the need to protect "important" Senators.

Let me offer a few examples. The fiscal year 2004 omnibus appropriation included a \$50 million earmark in the DOE's science account for an indoor rain forest alongside the interstate highway in Iowa, which I opposed, and so did my ranking member at the time, now the chairman.

The Department of Energy has been unable to execute this earmark because the sponsor has not produced the necessary non-Federal matching funds. Nearly \$45 million remains unspent and unspendable.

The House proposed to rescind this earmark, but the Senate refused to consider it. If ever there were a piece of low-hanging fruit ripe to be stripped out of the resolution, this is it. The 109th Congress had its infamous Bridge to Nowhere. The 110th Congress is now building its own legacy, starting with a \$50 million "roadside attraction" in Iowa.

In the NNSA weapons account, the House identified several sources of significant savings. The House proposed a total of \$495 million of reductions from weapons activities, but the Senate again refused to accept this reduction because of perceived impact in New Mexico. The final CR contains only \$94.5 million of reduction, leaving \$400 million of savings untapped.

In the fossil fuel account, 2006 funding in Energy included \$49.7 million for oil and gas research, which is funded at discretionary spending in fiscal year 2006, but which is now mandatory by the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

The House proposed again, rightly, to eliminate this discretionary funding in the CR, which only duplicates the new mandatory funding. Instead, the Senate declared this account to be "untouchable" in the strong interest of a particular Senator in West Virginia.

Given the House majority passed H.R. 6 to take away perceived windfall profits in the oil and gas industry, it is surprising that it would now allow the same industry to "double dip" in the CR.

In summary, I would say again that the process being followed with this CR greatly disadvantages the House in our negotiations with the other body. Members should not delude themselves that we have stripped all of the pork from the CR. We have only succeeded in stripping out the House earmarks. Over in the other Chamber, it is, frankly, business as usual.

We have had the opportunity to realize a half billion dollars of savings in energy and water portions of the CR and to apply those funds to other priority needs such as education, health care and law enforcement. I hope you all realize that in voting for this continuing resolution today means that you have decided that several hundred million of tax dollars will be better spent on welfare for the nuclear weapons labs than on these other pressing national needs.

I encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to vote against this resolution and get rid of the pork.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a case of the pot calling the kettle black, we have just heard it.

The gentleman is objecting because we were not able to go back 2 years to excise from a previous appropriation the rain forest project which was put into your bill when you were chairman. We have eliminated all earmarks for today and tomorrow. We cannot be expected to correct all of your mistakes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There remain 9 minutes, 50 seconds for the gentleman from California and 9 minutes and 30 seconds for the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. LEWIS, for the opportunity to speak on this bill.

I oppose the bill; and the reason why, Mr. Speaker, is I think it is very important for our constituents to understand.

Yes, there was a mandate in November as there had been a growing mandate throughout the year to get rid of earmarks. Now when my constituents supported the President's call to get rid of \$18 billion worth of earmarks, what they thought he meant was reducing spending \$18 billion. They do not want earmarks eliminated for the sake of taking them out of the hands of elected people and putting them in the hands of non-elected bureaucrats, yet that is what this omnibus bill does.

Now in the ag section, the total spending has gone from 100 to \$150 billion down. That sounds like a good savings, some of it. You can argue, where did the savings come from?

□ 1445

One thing that was eliminated, \$70 million in environmental quality incentive program, \$44 million for conservation security programs. These are programs that help farmers, and they have a cost share. It helps farmers plan on environmental repairs, keeping nutrients out of flowing into streams, safe environmental practices on dairies like building lagoons, things like that.

The bill also eliminated \$74 million in watershed and flood prevention, building small dams, and it eliminates

\$2 million from the USDA biomass program. Now at a time when we all want energy independence, eliminating the biomass program in the USDA doesn't make sense to me.

Also it eliminates \$11 million in food stamp funding for the employment and training portion of food stamps. All important things.

But where does the money go? For one thing, it goes to the FDA bureaucrats. The FDA wanted about a \$20 million increase. They get, under this bill, a \$100 million increase, without a single committee hearing on it.

Again, though, it is not just that the FDA is getting money. It is that the taxpayers aren't getting money. Earmarks have been eliminated, but the money does not go back to the taxpayers. It simply goes to the bureaucracy. And that is why I think we should recommit this bill because we can do a better job.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee.

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would, first of all, like to thank Chairman OBEY. Under his leadership, the Appropriations Committee, and this Congress, has moved quickly to bring resolution to the fiscal work left undone in the last Congress.

I would also like to thank my partner, DAVE HOBSON, who just spoke a moment ago, and all of the members of the Energy and Water Subcommittee for their dedication and cooperation. And while I am at it, I would associate myself with the remarks of Mr. HOBSON relative to the negotiations with the other body.

I am disappointed that we are here today finishing a CR from last year. I would have liked my first role as the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee to be focused on next year's responsibilities, instead of cleaning up the fiscal mess that was left to us.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, this bill provides \$300 million to improve the Department of Energy's ability to proceed with vital renewable energy and conservation research and development. This will allow the Department of Energy to pursue more technologies that would hold promise for reducing the emission of greenhouse gases and the importation of foreign oil while supporting the growth of our economy.

Given the energy crisis facing our Nation, and the implications it poses for our economy, our environment, and national security, these investments in energy research simply could not wait any longer.

This measure also provides \$200 million to bolster physical science research. This increase is a first step in a long overdue improvement in government support for research into physical sciences.

Looking ahead, I hope to work with my partner, Mr. HOBSON, as well as again, all of the members of the subcommittee. And I would indicate to my colleagues that I remain very concerned about the size of our weapons complex and the lack of progress being made to rationalize it in conformity to existing treaty agreements and current international circumstances.

Given this, and several other major initiatives being proposed by the Department of Energy, coupled with its fundamental failure to bring major projects in on time, let alone under budget, I will ask for the subcommittee to carefully and judiciously examine all major initiatives being undertaken so that we may fulfill our responsibility as good stewards of the people's money.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. WAMP, the Appropriations Committee ranking member of the legislative branch.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, the first 100 hours is over. That was the easy part; softballs, for the most part, that you campaigned on and that many of us joined you on. But this is where the tough work of governing begins, really, and I don't want to join in the blame game because there is plenty to go around from last year and the Senate Republicans and this year in this bill.

But as a 10-year member of the Appropriations Committee, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee to bring this legislation to the committee. Don't bring it straight to the floor. \$463 billion worth of spending, and it is not a CR. It is not a clean CR. A lot of bells and whistles here.

As a matter of fact, the distinguished chairman is known for carrying pencils in his coat pocket, and I wonder how many of those pencils he burned up putting this together. It was a lot of work. I commend you for this work. But it is a huge shift in priorities and it didn't come to the committee. So that is what I would ask is you go through the regular order and let's not do this again.

And then let me ask you specifically about the legislative branch portion of this bill. Page 137, because our chief administrative officer, I understand, will have money in this CR to stand up a committee which is controversial, even on your own side, this proposed Select Committee for Climate Change. And I would yield the balance of my time to you, Mr. Chairman, to ask, is there money in the legislative branch portion of this bill to fund what is not an authorized committee yet, but the proposed committee, Select Committee for Climate Change?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. OBEY. The answer is that there is money, there is adequate money to provide for that committee, if, in fact, it is created. But the formal action on creation has not yet taken place.

Mr. WAMP. And reclaiming my time, the Katrina Select Committee on our

side was roughly a \$400,000 committee. My understanding, the authority under this bill for the Select Committee on Climate Change would be about three times that amount, \$1.2 million. I think we need to go through the regular order there as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for a colloquy.

Mr. WEINER. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the President and the Republican Congress drastically cut funding for the highly successful COPS program. In 1999 Congress appropriated \$1.2 billion for the COPS program, and funding has plummeted since. The President has zeroed out this program every year since taking office and Congress gave no funding for COPS in either fiscal year 2006, or in the House-passed SSJC bill for fiscal year 2007. While the Office of Justice Programs, Community Oriented Policing Services account referenced in section 20901 of the continuing resolution today includes other worthy programs, is it your preference that the additional funding be used for enhancement grants which can be used to hire additional police?

Mr. OBEY. My preference is that additional funding would be available for enhancement grants which can be used for hiring. But that final decision will be up to the administration.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Georgia). The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 5 minutes, 50 seconds. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing from the other side of the aisle that they support our troops. Yet, this CR removes \$3 billion from our troops and their families. I offered an amendment to fix this and they refused.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I, once again, repeat, this bill does not cut BRAC. It adds \$1 billion to BRAC. The fiscal 2006 level was \$1.5 billion. This bill will have \$2.5 billion, and we will be adding more in the emergency supplemental.

Mrs. DRAKE. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OBEY. With whatever time I have remaining of the 15 seconds.

Mrs. DRAKE. Well, the article that I am reading, not just information that I have, is a continuing resolution released Monday night axes more than half of the money the Pentagon needs to meet its base realignment.

Mr. OBEY. With all due respect, I don't live in the world of newspaper articles. We produced this bill. I know what is in it. I would hope the gentlewoman would also learn what is in it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. OBEY, who was the ranking member in the last Congress, and who worked with Mr. LEWIS to try to pass our appropriation bills and, in fact, we passed all but one of the appropriation bills. Unfortunately, we reported the Labor Health bill, which is the largest bill, other than the Defense bill, in June, and it failed to ever get to the floor of this House because it included minimum wage, and that was not favored by the majority.

Now that we are in the majority, we are left with unfinished business. The gentlelady from Virginia mentions cutting something. We haven't cut anything. As a matter of fact, we have added \$1 billion.

If you had passed your appropriation bills, you may have been able to fund at appropriate levels. But you did not pass your appropriation bills. Yet, we hear on the floor today constant complaining from the other side of the aisle that they don't like the way we fixed their failures.

Well, very frankly, I think the American public will. First of all, the American public will be pleased that we are acting, that we are moving on this legislation, which is, essentially, the funding of 9 appropriation bills that failed to move through the House of Representatives and the Senate and to the President as they should have.

Mr. OBEY has worked very hard with Senator BYRD. I know Mr. LEWIS' staff has been very engaged in this as well. I know the Senate staff has been engaged in it. And I am hopeful that this bill will not only pass this House with a very handy vote.

There are many people in this House, on the Republican side of the aisle who asked to achieve exactly what Mr. OBEY has achieved in this bill. He has taken care of the veterans. He has taken care of veterans health. He has taken care of, for the first time in 4 years, trying to get college students Pell Grants that will give them some additional help to fund their college costs. When we had that vote on the floor of this House, we had 124 Republicans join us in that vote. This is one additional step in trying to get college students a more affordable education.

Mr. OBEY has moved in a number of areas to make our investments more productive and a better return for the American people. And this bill will provide for getting last year's business done that was left undone, so that we can move on to have what Mr. WAMP wants, and I want, and Mr. OBEY wants and Mr. LEWIS wants. That is, full and open discussion of the bills in subcommittee, in the full committee and on this floor. I think that is what we will have.

But ladies and gentlemen of this House, we need to complete last year's undone business. It wasn't our fault that it was not done. But whoever's

fault it was, it is not useful to say that it is your fault or my fault or somebody else's fault. It is useful to say we need to move forward. We need to fund government services. We need to fund the priorities of the American people. That is what this continuing resolution does.

I congratulate Mr. OBEY, and I urge all of our colleagues to support this bill so we can finally, one-third of the way into the fiscal year, finally do what we should have done by September 30 of 2006.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, somewhat responding to the majority leader's comment, I can't help but be moved to say that he suggested directly that Mr. OBEY had spent a good deal of time with the gentleman from the Senate, Mr. BYRD, the two Members involved in this bill, and beyond that, a good deal of contact with our staff. Beyond those two Members, let me say that this has been a very fine product. It is a staff, nonelected staffperson's piece of work that involves \$463.5 billion of appropriations.

I must say that it is important for me that the body know that I am committed to reducing the rate of growth of spending. \$463.5 billion is a pretty significant rate of growth.

□ 1500

But in the meantime, as we go about reducing spending growth, I will also work in a bipartisan spirit to move our bill through the committee and on time and under budget.

I will not, however, respond to either intimidation or any threats relative to the way we are handling the appropriations process. The Appropriations Committee will not become a small colony in the empire of this new leadership.

We renew our commitment to bills produced by regular order that will serve as a credit to our committee, to the national interest, as well as to the people from our districts we pretend to serve.

With that, the leader and I will work further together on this matter, but I am very concerned about the volume of staff direction here where in the final analysis the people know that they are not elected representatives of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield the gentleman (Mr. HOYER) another minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, but I want to say, first of all, when he talks about \$463 billion, I read in the newspaper today where OMB was very pleased that we stayed within the caps imposed by the Republican-passed budget. We took the Republican-passed budget, we took those numbers, we stayed within those caps. That is exactly what you did, Mr. LEWIS, when you were chairman of the committee because that was the direction from the Budget Committee. I am understanding that the White House even said that they were pleased with

the fact that we stayed within the numbers when you talk about spending.

Secondly, let me say that you and I both served on the Appropriations Committee for a long period of time. In recent years, of course, we have not passed all the appropriation bills in the calendar year, much less the fiscal year, and we would pass omnibus appropriation bills with hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars larger than this bill. One was passed January 31, the other was passed February 5. They were passed as conference reports with 1 hour of debate and no amendments, in which substantial legislative language had been added in conference and not vetted on this floor or in committee.

I understand the gentleman's representations, but he and I have been here a long time and we have a long history of knowing what has transpired in the past. This is a process that was required by the failure of the last Congress to do its work. It has been done in a way that tries to get it done so that we can get on to do exactly what the gentleman wants for the 2008 bills, give them a full airing, full hearings. And I predict to my distinguished and very close friend, Mr. LEWIS, we are going to have a lot more hearings as we did when we were in charge, we had more hearings than we have had.

We are going to have oversight, and we are going to have careful scrutiny of the taxpayers' dollars. And I look forward to joining my friend in that process in the regular order. We are doing this so that we can get on to that process to do exactly what the gentleman suggests because it is the right thing to do. And I look forward to working with him on that process.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes and 5 seconds.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I won't take the full 4 minutes. Let me simply say that it is necessary for the House to move forward with this legislation. It is easy to nitpick. It is interesting to me that the minority today has chosen to chastise us for decisions that we made not to go back 2 years and repeal some of the mistakes that the minority made when they were in the majority. They argue that we should have done that; they argue that we should have lived with a simple continuing resolution at '06 levels. If we do that, that would mean we would not have the added funding for veterans health care, we would not have the added funding for BRAC, we would not have the added funding for the National Institutes of Health; we would not be able to raise the Pell grant by \$260 for the maximum grant; we would not have the extra funding for energy research.

I would ask Members to recognize that after a full year of the Republican

minority not being able to produce and finish their work, it is time for us to finish their work so we can move on. The President is producing his new budget on February 5, which is next Monday. We need to clear the decks so we can deal with that afresh.

I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express great concern over the decreased funding for the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) in the Continuing Resolution for Fiscal Year 2007. Specifically, I am concerned about the drastic cuts to the Mobile Enforcement Teams (MET) and the Regional Enforcement Teams (RET). The MET and RET teams are on the front line each and every day assisting state and local law enforcement agencies to combat the onslaught of drug trafficking. The MET program will be reduced by \$30 million and the RET Program will be reduced by \$9 million. The priorities in this bill do not represent the priorities of this Nation. How is it that \$50 million can be set aside for a rainforest in Iowa in a so-called earmark-free continuing resolution, yet the DEA faces a massive reduction?

The district I represent, California's Fourth Congressional District, will feel the effects of these cuts. In particular, Nevada County faces a tremendous battle with methamphetamines every day. Methamphetamines are becoming an epidemic in this country. This reduction in funding will not only hurt the efforts of law enforcement, but also everyone who lives in a neighborhood being overrun with drugs and drug traffickers. This is the wrong time to be cutting the federal government's primary tool to combat methamphetamine on a local level.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today Congress is considering a long-term continuing appropriations bill to fund large portions of the Federal Government through the end of fiscal year 2007. This legislation is necessary because Congress did not complete the appropriations process last year.

There are many reasons to support this bill. For example, the bill increases Pell Grant funding to make college more affordable, IDEA funding by \$200 million to help our neediest students, and Head Start funding by \$100 million to give our youngest kids the opportunity to learn. Funding for housing opportunities is increased by \$1.4 billion. Without the increase HUD would be forced to deny approximately 220,000 voucher renewals.

The bill also boosts funding for local law enforcement by increasing funding for both the COPS program and the Byrne Justice Assistance Grants which directly impact funding for local law enforcement efforts.

NASA aeronautics funding, vital to the Cleveland economy, was increased by \$166 million over the president's budget request. Furthermore, the bill contained an extension of the layoff ban, and prevents the NASA Administrator from gutting NASA Glenn.

I also support the \$3.6 billion increase in veterans healthcare funding that provides service for an anticipated increase of at least 325,000 patients and to meet rising healthcare costs. In the same vein, Defense Health Programs are increased by \$1.2 billion to provide care for service members and their families—including treating service members wounded in action in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Our Nation is facing a crisis in healthcare. The bill provides necessary relief for the Community Health Center to finance over 300 new

or expanded health centers, serving an estimated 1.2 million new patients. The bill boosts funding for the Ryan White CARE Grants, the National Institutes of Health and the Indian Health Service.

The bill adds \$1.3 billion to expand efforts to combat HIV/AIDS and TB. At the same time, \$248 million was added to the Agency for International Development Malaria Programs to expand its bilateral global malaria initiative activities.

The bill adds considerable funding for the protection of the environment by adding \$197.1 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. The revolving fund is distributed by formula and will fund additional water and wastewater infrastructure projects in every state, including Ohio.

The bill adds \$100 million to cover operational shortfalls for parks, refuges, forests and other public lands; including facilities in northeastern Ohio.

The bill adds \$1.5 billion for the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Resources program to accelerate research and development activities for renewable energy and energy efficiency programs.

Finally, the bill forces greater transparency in the activities of the World Bank, requiring them to report public disclosure of loan agreements between World Bank and its borrowers. This sunshine rule will help ensure the World Bank loans are not destructive to third world nations.

Unfortunately, this bill includes over \$6 billion in nuclear weapons funding that I oppose. I have voted against the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which contains funding for nuclear weapons, since 2002. I cannot bring myself to vote for any legislation that further endangers the world. I regret not being able to vote for all the positive aspects of this bill, but my conscience and my concerns about the threat which nuclear weapons pose to the world matter more.

Furthermore, I am concerned about the potential loss of jobs in Cleveland relating to the BRAC process. I appreciate that the bill contains additional funds for the BRAC process. I urge the Committee on Appropriations to fully fund the BRAC process as soon as possible to ensure the additional DFAS jobs can be transferred to Cleveland as previously scheduled.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 20, providing further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2007.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for working in a bipartisan manner to construct a resolution that continues to fund the government for the remainder of the fiscal year. As Chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives, I am especially pleased to note that H.J. Res. 20 restores funding that is absolutely vital to conducting an accurate and cost-efficient 2010 census.

The funding in this bill will enable the Census Bureau to move forward with plans for the first-ever automated census in 2010. In addition to saving time and money, utilizing handheld computers will improve accuracy and ensure the most precise enumeration possible of the American people. According to Preston Jay Waite, Associate Director for the Decennial Census, field trials have resulted in a 91 percent accuracy rate.

As preparations for the 2010 Census proceed, active oversight will be important to en-

sure that all Americans are counted fairly. In 2000, the national census missed at least three million people—mostly the poor and minorities. I look forward to working with Ranking Member MICHAEL TURNER of Ohio and my other Subcommittee colleagues to conduct essential oversight needed to see that this never happens again.

Mr. Speaker, the action we have taken today will guarantee that we don't retreat from the goal of using technology to improve the way we keep track of changes in our population. I thank my colleagues for passing this continuing resolution and will support efforts in the Senate to pass this legislation with the same commitment to adequately funding the 2010 Census.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 20, which among other things avert the impending budgetary train wreck left by the Republican-controlled 109th Congress. I want to pay particular tribute to Mr. OBEY, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his incredible work in fashioning this legislation that will enable us to put behind us the mess left by last Congress and get on to the important business of addressing the real and pressing needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, last November millions of Americans went to the polls to register the strong disgust with the Republican dominated control of the legislative and executive branches of our Federal Government. Americans were fed up with a Republican Congress and its legacy of a culture of corruption, its failure to address the pressing needs of the American people, its unwillingness to provide effective oversight of the executive branch, its fiscal irresponsibility that resulted in record budget deficits and added trillions to the national debt, and its ability to complete one of the most basic tasks of the legislative branch: to pass the appropriations bills needed to fund the government. Is it any wonder that Americans were voting for a new way of doing the people's business when they elected the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate? I think not. We Democrats promised a new and better direction for America. And we have been delivering.

Mr. Speaker, behold what we accomplished in less than the first 100 legislative hours of our majority. We passed H.R. 1, which implements the recommendations of the 911 Commission; we passed H.R. 2, raising the minimum wage by \$2.10 an hour over three years and providing a much needed raise to nearly 5 million workers; we passed H.R. 3, which will provide funding for embryonic stem cell research and provide hope for millions of Americans suffering from some of the most debilitating illnesses.

But we did not stop there. We passed H.R. 4, which requires Medicaid to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for our seniors and disabled citizens; we passed H.R. 5, which will make college more affordable to middle and working class Americans by cutting the interest rate on federally insured student loans in half; and we passed H.R. 6, which is a substantial start in making this country more energy independent.

And we accomplished all this, Mr. Speaker, after draining the swamp and ending the culture of corruption by adopting the strongest, toughest ethics and lobbying rules in history.

Today, we clean up the fiscal mess left by the Republican-led 109th Congress. The last

Congress abdicated its duty to be a faithful and responsible steward of the public fisc. They shirked their responsibility to establish the right priorities and make the right choices to serve the American people. They failed to pass nine of the eleven appropriations bills needed to sustain the operations of government for Fiscal Year 2007.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to your superb leadership, and especially the extraordinary legislative craftsmanship of our remarkable Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we rectify these Republican failures today. The Continuing Resolution we take up today, H.J. Res. 20, is not the ideal manner to fund the government and contains some provisions that each of us might not like, unlike the President's decision to escalate the war in Iraq, the choices reflected in H.J. Res. 20 represent the best available alternatives out of a universe of worst choices. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support for the Fiscal Year 2007 Continuing Resolution, and my appreciation to the leadership, the Chairman and members of the Committee, and for all my colleagues who join me in voting for H.J. Res. 20.

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 20, totals \$463.5 billion, the amount remaining under the Republican budget resolution for the current fiscal year. Most programs are funded at FY 2006 levels with increases to cover the cost of pay increases. Of course, it was also necessary to make additions to maintain staffing levels, avoid furloughs, and generally meet increased costs or workloads for agencies, particularly the Department of Justice, the federal judiciary, the Social Security Administration, the FAA (including air traffic control), international peacekeeping operations, the Indian Health Service, the Food and Drug Administration, and the USDA Food Safety Inspection Service.

But Mr. Speaker, because the new Democratic majority knows how to, and does not shirk from, choosing wisely and setting the right priorities, in this continuing resolution we were also able to provide significant new investments for high priority needs in many areas, including veterans healthcare and assistance, law enforcement, public health, housing and education, scientific research, energy independence, transportation, and the environment. Let me discuss briefly some of the more important and beneficial provisions.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

In the area of veterans healthcare, the resolution provides \$32.3 billion, an increase of \$3.6 billion above the FY 2006 funding levels to provide service for the anticipated increase of at least 325,000 veteran patients and to meet rising healthcare costs, especially of our returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan. As President Lincoln reminded us 142 years ago, we have a moral obligation to care for him whom has born the battle, and for his widow and orphan. We are going to keep that commitment.

We also provide \$21.2 billion, an increase of \$1.2 billion to provide care for service members and their families, including treating service members wounded in action in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, we will never neglect the needs of those who proudly don the uniform in the defense of the United States. That is why the resolution provides \$13.4 billion to fund the Basic Allowance for Housing, an increase of \$500 million. This increased funding is

needed to provide a down payment towards the funding shortfall caused by higher housing rates.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

In the vitally important area of public safety, law enforcement, and crime prevention, the resolution increases the funding for the Federal Bureau of Investigation by \$216.6 million to fully fund 31,359 positions, including 12,213 agents and 2,577 Intelligence Analysts—doubling the number of Intelligence Analysts since September 11th. This amount also includes \$100 million to proceed the FBI's plan to move from paper-based case management to electronic data sharing. The resolution also includes \$147.4 million for counter-terrorism and intelligence infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I know that investing in crime prevention programs is an effective use of the taxpayers' precious dollars. That is why I am pleased that the resolution provides \$520 million for Byrne Justice Assistance Formula Grants, an increase of \$109 million, and \$542 million for Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), an increase of \$70 million. Together these increases are the first step in reversing the drastic cuts to State and local law enforcement programs made since the Bush administration came into office in 2001. I will immediately make the request for the U.S. Justice Department to fund the new crime-prevention needs of Houston.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, education is destiny. The surest and most certain path to continued American prosperity lies in an educated citizenry. That is why I am especially pleased that for the first time in 4 years, the maximum Pell Grant has been increased, by \$260 to \$4,310. This long-overdue increase will help over 5.3 million students pay rising college expenses.

The resolution also provides \$10.7 billion for IDEA Part B State grants, an increase of \$200 million to help school districts serve 6.9 million children with disabilities and special needs. If we are going to be serious about leaving no child behind, then we must make sure to adequately fund special education.

But there is more, Mr. Speaker. The resolution increases Title I K–12 Grants by \$125 million and provides more than 38,000 additional low-income children performing below grade level with intensive reading and math instruction. Thus, we have begun to reverse the decline since 2005 in Title I support for elementary and secondary schools at a time of record enrollments (55 million students in 2006) and pressures for more accountability from No Child Left Behind requirements.

The resolution also contains \$125 million targeted to the 6,700 schools that failed to meet No Child Left Behind requirements in the 2005–2006 school year, enabling them to implement improvement activities, such as teacher training, tutoring programs, and curriculum upgrades. According to the Department of Education, without this funding more than 80 percent of high-poverty districts would be unable to afford these improvements.

The value and efficacy of Head Start is well known and long established. That is why it is so scandalous that the Bush Administration has cut this program by 11 percent in real dollars since 2002. The resolution increases funding by \$103.7 million to help prevent a drop in Head Start enrollments. The money

the Department of Education will have will still allow for teacher incentive pay for Houston.

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

The resolution provides \$1.9 billion, an increase of \$206.9 million to finance more than 300 critically need new or expanded health centers, serving an estimated 1.2 million new patients. We also increase Ryan White CARE Grants by \$75.8 million to bring it to its authorized funding level of \$1.2 billion.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

One of the most important investments this nation can make to secure its long-term future is in the area of scientific research. As a long-term member of the Science Committee, I am keenly aware that to keep ahead of our international competitors we cannot scrimp when it comes to expanding the Nation's intellectual capital and knowledge base. That is why the resolution wisely funds the National Institutes of Health at \$28.9 billion, an increase of \$619.5 million. This level of funding reverses a projected decline in new NIH research project awards and supports an additional 500 research project grants, 1,500 first time investigators, and expands funding for high risk and high impact research.

The resolution also provides an additional \$50 million in new funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) innovation programs for physical science research and lab support for nanotechnology and neutron research. Equally important, the resolution increases provides funding for the National Science Foundation in the amount of \$4.7 billion, an increase of \$335 million. This increase is a down-payment towards enhancing U.S. global competitiveness by investing in basic science research.

Mr. Speaker, in an area close to my heart and important to my district, which is often referred to as the Energy Capital of the nation, the resolution increases funding to the Department of Energy's Office of Science by \$200 million to support cutting edge research, including new energy technologies such as improved conversion of cellulosic biomass to biofuels. I also appreciate that the resolution increases funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy resources by \$300 million which will enable us to accelerate research and development activities for renewable energy and energy efficiency programs. NASA and in particular the Johnson Space Center can be funded by redisbursing funds in the Agency to avoid lost jobs and the stopping of important work. I will work for the continued work of NASA.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Speaker, as Hurricane Katrina laid bare for all the world to see, affordable housing has for too long been a neglected priority in this country. The resolution makes a modest but useful stab at correcting this woeful situation. The Section 8 Tenant-Based Program is funded at \$15.9 billion, an increase of \$502 million, which will enable the Department of Housing and Urban Development to renew 70,000 housing vouchers currently in use by individuals and families. The Section 8 Project-Based Program is budgeted at \$5.9 billion, an increase of \$939 million. This much needed increase will help HUD renew 157,000 housing vouchers currently in use by individuals and families.

Although no one likes to live in public housing, we must remember that for millions of our

fellow citizens they are their home and sanctuary. For too long they have been neglected, which has led to an accelerated state of disrepair. That is why it is encouraging to see that the resolution provides an extra increase \$300 million to enable Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) to address critical operating needs after last year's energy hikes saddled them with \$287 million in unexpected utility costs. Although this increase is still \$672 million short of the total estimated need of \$4.5 billion, it will help to restore staff levels, maintenance activities, elderly service coordinators, security officers and equipment.

Also Mr. Speaker, the resolution contains language changing the funding formula for the Section 8 Tenant-Based Program. The current formula is based on information from 2004 that is out of date and results in some Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) getting more money than they can spend while others have less than they need. The resolution corrects this problem by directing HUD to use the most recent 12-month leasing and cost data. Last week HUD announced that a similar provision would be included in their 2008 budget request to be implemented in 2009. By including the language now, 2007 funds will be put to their intended use—funding housing units for low-income families and individuals rather than sitting unspent.

TRANSPORTATION GUARANTEES

Next to human capital, few things are as important to the nation's economic future as its physical infrastructure, especially its roads and bridges. That is why it is very good news that the federal aid highway program is fully funded at the level guaranteed in the SAFETEA-LU Act by providing an obligation limitation of \$39.1 billion for FY 2007, \$3.5 billion over the FY 2006 enacted level; and funding for Federal mass transit programs is increased by \$470 million to \$8.97 billion to meet the transit funding guarantees as required by SAFETEA-LU.

GLOBAL HEALTH

Mr. Speaker, America is a generous and compassionate Nation. That is why it is consistent with our values that the resolution increases Global HIV/AIDS funding by \$1.3 billion to \$4.5 billion. This increase will help to expand efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, and TB programs including in the 15 focus countries and the multilateral efforts through the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria.

I am proud that the United States is doing more than its share in helping to eradicate malaria, which is still too often an unnecessarily fatal disease in too many parts of the world. The resolution funds the Agency for International Development's Malaria programs in the amount of \$248 million, an increase of \$149 million. This will allow U.S. AID to expand its bilateral global malaria initiative activities from the current 3 countries to 7. Country programs expand access to long-lasting insecticide treated bed nets, promote and support effective malaria treatment through the use of proven combination therapies; and increase prevention efforts targeted to pregnant women.

MORATORIUM ON DIRECTED SPENDING PROJECTS

Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution explicitly eliminates directed spending projects ("earmarks") for Fiscal Year 2007 and retains the moratorium on earmarking in place until a reformed process was put in place. Unfortunately, many worthy earmarks are not funded

including the Boys and Girls Clubs, America's Promise, and the Thousand Points of Light Foundation. I know many of my colleagues are disappointed that the budgetary mismanagement by the Republican-controlled 109th Congress necessitated this draconian measure. In spite of this prohibition I will fight to secure funding for the TSU Lab School and other projects.

But I take some consolation in Chairman OBEY's assurance that earmarks included in this year's appropriations bills will be eligible for consideration in the 2008 process, subject to new standards for transparency and accountability and that the Committee and leadership will work to restore an accountable, above-board, transparent process for funding decisions and put an end to the abuses that have harmed the credibility of Congress.

Although the resolution eliminates earmarks for the current fiscal year, I note Mr. Speaker, that the resolution will, however, continue to help State and local governments meet the needs of their communities by providing funding for grants through authorized discretionary and formula programs including Teacher Incentive Grants, Corps of Engineers programs, Military Construction, Department of Energy science programs, Agricultural Research Service operations, and the USDA Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most compelling reason for supporting H. Res. 20 is that stated by Chairmen OBEY and BYRD in their Joint Statement of December 13, with which I close:

There is no good way out of the fiscal chaos left behind by the outgoing Congress. Indeed, this joint resolution provides the Administration far too much latitude in spending the people's money. But that is a temporary price that we will pay in order to give the President's new budget the attention and oversight it deserves and requires, and so that we can begin work right away at putting the people's priorities front and center. We, in the new Congress, have a responsibility to build the foundation for a better future. We cannot begin that work until we fix the problems left behind by the Republican Congress. So, we must turn the page on the Republican failures and work together in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support H.J. Res. 20 so we can move forward and attend to real and pressing needs of the American people.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuing resolution.

Today we are in this colossal mess because last year's Republican Congress failed to do its job.

Instead of passing the necessary spending bills to fund our Government, Republicans decided they would rather pass the buck.

Instead of owning up to their failure today, Republicans are crying foul! What hypocrisy Mr. Speaker!

Under Republican rule we have seen our country's finances literally flushed down the toilet. Our Nation's debt grew by over \$3 trillion thanks to the Republicans. They passed massive tax cuts for the ultra rich. They got rid of common sense pay-as-you-go rules. And they started a completely unnecessary war in Iraq, whose true cost of nearly \$450 billion, they have tried to hide from taxpayers.

They had their chance to try and make amends last year, but they failed to act.

Today Democrats are picking up the pieces and leading our country in a new, fiscally responsible, direction.

This CR eliminates all earmarks, suspends the Congressional pay raise and provides critical increases to a number of important programs this year.

In particular, I want to thank Chairman OBEY and my colleagues on the appropriations committee for providing over \$4.7 billion for our global AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria programs in FY07. This money will ensure the continued scale-up of these programs and will provide lifesaving anti-retroviral therapy to another 350,000 people this year.

I am also very pleased that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will receive an increase of \$300 million for its public housing operating fund. This money will help the Oakland Housing Authority in my district to keep our public housing units open so that we can provide stable housing to thousands of low-income individuals and families who are in need.

Additionally the \$1.4 billion increase for Section 8 housing programs and the change in formula will provide housing assistance for a quarter of a million people and help California get its fair share of funding to reflect rising rental costs in our state.

Although not perfect, today's CR sends a very powerful message that the Democratic Congress is strongly committed to helping those who are most vulnerable in a fiscally responsible manner.

Although we have still got a long ways to go to re-order our Nation's priorities, this CR is the first step. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the process used by the majority party to write and debate the bill under consideration today.

Ranking minority members were not consulted on this legislation or provided an opportunity for input. In fact, most of the majority party's own members had no input in this process. Appropriations Committee Chairman DAVID OBEY instead directed his staff members to write major budget legislation behind closed doors without involving elected Members of Congress. It appears staff members of Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman BOB BYRD conducted negotiations on behalf of the Senate.

As reported in CongressDaily AM today, "most of the negotiations were conducted by staff." This information came from Chairman OBEY, who also said that Members of Congress only became involved in the negotiations "when matters became difficult." Let me repeat that: Unelected congressional staff for Chairmen OBEY and BYRD conducted negotiations on 9 of 11 major spending bills that make up the annual budget of the United States Government.

Why do we have an Appropriations Committee if the committee members have no input in the appropriations process? I propose the next legislation this Congress should debate is a bill to dissolve the House Appropriations Committee. It is clearly unnecessary since major budget negotiations can be conducted by staff instead of elected Members. Apparently, the Appropriations Committee consists entirely of Chairman OBEY, who can single-handedly dictate the legislative process and assign his staff to take the place of elected Members of Congress.

Handing responsibilities for major budget negotiations to congressional staff for Chairmen OBEY and BYRD is an abdication of responsibility. It also sets the stage for corruption on many levels. These staff-level negotiations were unknown to the public and the majority of elected Members. I am deeply concerned that damage and corruption to our laws will occur if Members of Congress are not thoroughly involved in the creation of legislation and knowledgeable about the contents of bills brought to a vote.

In addition, allowing only 1 hour of debate and no opportunity for amendments on major \$463.5 billion legislation that Members had only 1 day to review is further evidence of the majority party's lack of consideration for our system of government and the responsibilities of elected Members. I also wish Congress had completed the budget process last year, but this fact does not excuse the closed process used to write H.J. Res. 20 this week.

I sincerely hope the majority party will begin including elected Members of Congress in the process of lawmaking, as the Constitution intended, and as the American people rightly expect. Our system of government of the people, for the people, and by the people depends upon our ability to work together to accomplish the business of the American people. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in calling for a return to the regular committee process and more fair and open debate of legislation with opportunities to offer amendments.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.J. Res. 20 the Continuing Resolution for FY 2007. Mr. Speaker, this is not the bill that I or any of my colleagues wish we were voting on today. This bill eliminates all earmarks, some for worthy projects like job training, community-based healthcare, and boys and girls clubs. I had hoped that each of the eleven FY 07 appropriations bills would have passed separately into law last year, with proper funding increases to ensure that we are investing for the future. Unfortunately, the last Congress only passed two.

The last Congress failed at this, and we are left now left to pass a continuing resolution for the rest of FY07 without the detailed fine-tuning and funding increases the bills normally contain. The Republican failures on the budget created the worst budget mess since the Government shut down in 1996. It is no wonder that the debt has increased by more than \$3 trillion since Republicans took control of the Government.

The funding of scientific research is crucial to our competitiveness, economic well-being, and quality of life. Flat funding in the context of inflation is difficult for everyone, but it is particularly damaging to scientific enterprise. Scientific budget items must change dramatically each year as large projects with short lives are constructed, go into operation, and are replaced. This year would be a particularly bad time for flat funding in the sciences. We have new international commitments to energy research and new national projects that have completed construction and require operating budgets. We also have unprecedented and much-needed consensus to increase funding in the sciences to keep pace with our international peers. To this end, wrote with two others letters to the Appropriations Committee raising concerns about the impact of flat funding on the Department of Energy's Office of

Science and on the National Science Foundation. These letters were signed by a sizeable fraction of the House, and I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has addressed this matter, fully for the NSF and appreciably for the DOE Office of Science. I look forward to increased funding for research at NSF and for fusion energy in the FY 08 appropriations.

I would like to point out a few positive points in the bill. This bill provides for a \$3.6 billion increase over last year's level for VA healthcare funding. I'm pleased that this increase will make it possible for us to provide services for an additional 325,000 patients in the VA medical system, and to meet rising healthcare costs as have more returning veterans than any time since the Vietnam era. I'm also pleased that the bill includes some \$4 billion for our housing program for military families. These gains are important, but we have much more to do. As we begin looking at funding priorities for fiscal year 2008 and beyond, I believe it is imperative that the Congress finally meet America's obligation to provide for full funding of our veterans' health care system. VA hospital and clinic administrators cannot provide consistent, quality services and proper continuity of care over time unless they know how much money they have to work with. The existing discretionary appropriations process for VA healthcare is not working, and only a move to mandatory funding can solve this chronic problem. I look forward to voting for such a proposal this year.

The bill raises the maximum Pell grant award from \$4,050 to \$4,310. This increase, the first in 4 years, recognizes the essential role of the Pell grant program in improving access to higher education and as a critical component in comprehensive efforts to address college affordability. For years under Republican leadership, Congress all but ignored the growing college cost crisis that was preventing many qualified students from going to college. Now, in just the first month of this new Democratic Congress, the House has already voted overwhelmingly to cut interest rates on need-based Federal student loans. And we have another major step towards putting a college education within reach of every qualified student by boosting the Pell grant scholarship by \$260.

The bill also increases Title I school funding by \$125 million, bringing total funding from \$12.7 to \$12.8 billion. The proposed increase would reverse the decline in Title I funding since 2005 and would allow additional reading and math services for some 38,000 eligible children. I also support the proposed \$125 million for the Title I school improvement fund. These funds, if passed would be targeted to the 6,700 schools designated as needing improvement under No Child Left Behind, thereby allowing them to implement professional development initiatives, tutoring programs, and other improvements designed to raise student achievement.

The bill also spends \$4.5 billion, an increase of \$1.3 billion, to expand efforts to combat HIV/AIDS and TB programs, including in the 15 focus countries and the multilateral efforts through the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria. The bill also spends \$248 million, an increase of \$149 million, to allow the Agency to expand its bilateral global malaria initiative activities from the current three countries to seven.

The chairman deserves ones thanks for negotiating a bill better than a traditional con-

tinuing resolution, which would have jeopardized American national security, resulted in thousands of layoffs, and cut off healthcare for members of the U.S. Armed Forces and veterans. For example, the Food Safety and Inspection Service would have faced a month of furloughs, resulting in the closure of 6,000 meat processing plants; the federal judiciary would have had to fire 2,500 workers; and the Princeton Plasma Physics Lab and other research facilities would have had to stop projects and layoff scientists. I ask my colleagues to pass this bill so that we can begin the FY 08 appropriations and make more important investments in our future.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of cleaning up the Republicans' mess. The previous Congress failed to pass 9 of 11 appropriations bills, creating the worst budget mess since the Government shut down in 1996.

Today's resolution is far from perfect. But while adhering to the spending limit in the Republican budget, it provides significant funding increases to several important programs.

First, the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2007 provides housing assistance to 227,000 people through a \$1.4 billion increase for section 8 housing programs. Second, it finances construction of hundreds of new community health centers and improvements to existing facilities. Third, today's bill increases funding for Head Start by \$104 million to help prevent a drop in enrollments. Fourth, it raises the maximum Pell grant by \$260, which will help more than 5.3 million students afford college.

It's time to get to work on the people's business. Cleaning up a mess is never fun, but because Republicans failed to take "personal responsibility" for this year's budget, it is necessary. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today is a day when being in the majority is about paying for the very long list of mistakes from the last (Republican) Congress that simply refused to pay the bills.

Well, this Congress will not proceed down that road. Before we can begin the regular funding process, we have to pay the bills the last Congress ran up, then did not pay. That's where we are today. And it is a position none of us are happy about.

There is a long list of items that should be in this CR that would have benefited the people in my south Texas Congressional district, but since the previous Congress could not be bothered to pay the bills, we will have to begin again to put these in our appropriations bills this year.

Among the many items that will now go unfunded is an improvement to help speed up repair of helicopters coming home from and going back to Iraq and Afghanistan at the Corpus Christi Army Depot.

The items that this CR is not funding are not the wasteful spending that characterized the last several Congresses. The items we are cutting here are important national priorities for the health, education and well being of our children and the less fortunate among us, as well as defense priorities for the Nation.

Just this morning, I chaired my first Readiness Subcommittee hearing—a joint hearing with Tactical Air and Land Subcommittee—where we heard time and time again about how much more help the depots needed to repair the equipment our soldiers in the field need so very much.

Not including the funding for helicopter repair at CCAD is part of the price we—as a nation—are paying for the disregard the previous Congress showed for the readiness of our troops, and for the disposition of the job Congress is elected to do.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, there are many things that can be said against this continuing resolution, as the House has heard during today's debate. But after all those things have been said, I am convinced the only responsible choice is to vote for it—and I will do so.

In fact, it was the failure of responsibility on the part of last year's Republican leadership in Congress that brought us to where we find ourselves today. If they had done their job of developing and enacting the legislation to fund the essential functions of government, it would not be necessary for us to be acting now to make up for their failures.

In fairness, much of the blame rests with the Republican-led Senate. While the House last year did pass all but one of the regular appropriations bills, only two of those bills ever received a final vote in the other body—and only those two were enacted into law.

But even here in the House, the Republican leadership never even brought to the floor the bill to fund the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services—not before the election, evidently because they did not want to have to discuss it during their campaigns, but not even in the lame-duck session last year.

Given the situation the resulted from their predecessors' failure, Chairman OBEY and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee decided that the best way to proceed was to bring forward this long-term continuing resolution, intended to complete action on appropriations for the remainder of this fiscal year, and then to begin work on the appropriations bills for the fiscal year that lies ahead.

I support that decision, and I will support this continuing resolution.

There are parts of it that I think fall short of what should be done in a number of areas. But there are other parts that I strongly support, including the provision that withholds any increase in the pay of Members of Congress—something that I think is overdue.

More than a year ago—in October of 2005—I urged the House's conferees to agree to a Senate amendment to the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill that would have withheld a cost of living raise for Members of Congress. I regret that my plea was in vain, because I think we should be prepared to do our part when our country is at war, our homeland security must be improved, and the federal budget remains deep in deficit.

Withholding a congressional pay raise will make only a small change in the budget because the amount involved is minor compared with other expenditures. However, I think it is an appropriate first step for Members of Congress to forego this increase in our pay, and I am glad this legislation will have that effect.

I also am very pleased that the resolution includes \$300 million in additional funding for the Department of Energy's Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, EERE, programs. My colleague Representative PERLMUTTER and I worked hard to get this funding included in the legislation, and I intend to work closely with

our colleagues in Congress and with the Department of Energy to ensure that the research programs carried out at National Renewable Energy Laboratory, NREL, in Colorado benefit from a good deal of those funds.

Despite the importance of NREL's work, flat or decreased funding for NREL in recent years—coupled with earmarks and inflationary cost increases—has effectively reduced the funding for renewable energy research, which has led to a continuing struggle for needed resources and great instability at the lab. This in turn has severely affected the lab's ability to develop new technologies and continue the United States' leadership in renewable energy technologies. The boost for EERE funding in this bill could go a long way toward helping NREL regain its critical momentum.

The parts of the legislation dealing with defense and national security include increased funding for defense health programs, for basic allowance for housing, and for two important Department of Energy nonproliferation programs—the International Nuclear Material Protection and Cooperation program, which secures weapons-grade nuclear materials in the former Soviet States, and the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, which secures high-risk nuclear material around the world.

It also includes \$2.5 billion for implementation of a round of military base closures authorized in 2005. While the \$2.5 billion is an increase from the funding provided for fiscal year 2006, it will still leave us \$3.1 billion short of meeting our Base Realignment and Closure, BRAC, commitments and nearly \$1 billion short of the funds needed for military construction projects. Since the Army links its military construction and troop movement plans to BRAC implementation, this shortfall could have broad impacts on the rotation and return of troops and the building of new brigades.

It has been indicated that additional needs for BRAC and military housing will be addressed in the supplemental war spending bill we will soon consider in Congress. I hope that will be the case, and will work to achieve that result as well as to ensure that the Defense Department takes into account Colorado priorities as it makes the hard choices about which military construction projects to fund.

I also am pleased that Chairman OBEY and his colleagues recognized the importance of science programs across different agencies, allowing for increases at the Department of Energy's Office of Science, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST.

However, I am greatly concerned about the impact this resolution could have on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA.

In my district, NOAA operates the Earth System Research Laboratory, which has the largest concentration of NOAA research staff in the Nation—300—as well as the largest concentration of university staff funded by NOAA research, for a total of 1,000 Federal and contract employees. NOAA's programs in Boulder include the Space Environment Center, which provides essential space weather forecasting services; the NOAA Profiler Network, which gathers key weather information for a range of other agencies, including the Departments of Defense and Transportation; and the National Geophysical Data Center, the world's largest archive of geophysical data on observations of earth from space.

Funding for NOAA under previous continuing-resolution levels saw significant decreases, so I am pleased that overall the agency will see a return to the funding levels provided for fiscal year 2006. However, it is unclear how this will be distributed, and so there is a possibility that many important programs will not be adequately funded. I believe that we will have to work to address these issues when we consider the appropriation bills for fiscal year 2008.

NIST also has a significant presence in Colorado. The NIST facilities at Boulder have contributed to great scientific advances, but these facilities are now over fifty years old and have not been well maintained. Many environmental factors such as the humidity and vibrations from traffic can affect the quality of research performed in the NIST labs. Scientists have difficulty conducting cutting edge research in labs that have leaking roofs. NIST has included building renovations as a priority in past budgets, yet the final budgets have included so many earmarks that the agency's needs have not been met. The absence of similar earmarks from this resolution means that NIST may finally be able to address some of its most dire needs, including renovations of the Boulder facilities. I will work to ensure that much of the nearly \$60 million in the NIST construction budget will be dedicated to renovating these facilities.

The appropriators had many tough choices to make with regards to funding the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA. Balancing the needs of the different NASA programs is critical and I appreciate that the appropriators realized that congressional intent needs to be clear and specific to ensure that no one program is completely devastated by funding cuts. While I am pleased that the decline in aeronautics research funding will be halted, I am also concerned about the cuts to the science and exploration programs, as well as to the space operations. It is not yet clear how NASA will accommodate these cuts. NASA is important to the Nation, and I will continue to push for adequate funding from my position as chairman of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee.

Education is vital to our country's youth and our economic future and I am pleased that the appropriators have provided several important programs with funding increases that will help keep our country strong. These include increases above the fiscal 2006 funding levels for Pell Grants, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, and Head Start. Furthermore, the appropriators made a step in the right direction by increasing funding in Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB.

And I am pleased that by this resolution the Federal-aid highway program, in the Federal Highway Administration, is fully funded at the level guaranteed in the Safe, Accountable Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, SAFETEA-LU, with an obligation limitation of \$39.1 billion for fiscal 2007, \$3.5 billion over the fiscal 2006 enacted level.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think Chairman OBEY and his colleagues deserve the thanks of the House for the work they have done to clear away the rubble left by the Republican leadership last year and to replace it with a firm foundation on which to build in the future. Adoption of this resolution will write an end to last year's sorry story and take the

first step on a better, more responsible approach to carrying out our duties as legislators. I urge approval of the joint resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before the House.

Few will take any great satisfaction with the manner in which the Congress is at last completing the budget process for 2007. This work was supposed to have been completed 4 months ago. It is important for everyone to understand how we got to this point and why we are forced to take the extraordinary step of approving a continuing resolution to fund nearly every domestic program for the balance of this fiscal year.

We are here today because the Republican majority that controlled the House last year failed to do its work. Last May, they voted for a budget resolution that was so unrealistic that not even they could find a way to live within it. As a direct result after 8 months, the former majority was able to complete action on just 2 of the 11 regular appropriations bills. Then, in early December, the outgoing leaders of the House and Senate decided to punt on the remaining funding bills, pass a stopgap spending bill to keep the Government operating through February 15, adjourn the Congress, and leave town.

So now it is up to the new Congress to clean up this budgetary mess as best we can, and that's what the bill before the House does. It is an imperfect solution. There are any number of programs that deserve a lot more funding than we are able to give them here today. We are still constrained by the overall funding levels adopted in last year's budget resolution, a budget that not a single Democrat voted for. At the same time, I am glad that the measure we are considering today manages to increase funding in a number of priority areas, especially veterans health care, medical care for U.S. troops wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Federal highway program, medical research at the National Institutes of Health as well as some key education programs. I also applaud the decision to put a moratorium on Members' earmarks until a reformed process is put in place to provide an accountable and transparent process for funding these projects.

Even so, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have gotten up to complain that we should have done better. They want less spending in some areas and more spending in others. After sitting on their hands for 8 months last year, they now object to the procedure we're using to clean up the mess they made. It is unfortunate that the people who are complaining the loudest today were unwilling to convince their own leadership to make these spending decisions last year by passing the individual funding bills on time and getting them to the President for his signature.

The reality is that we are already 4 months into fiscal year 2007. There isn't time to spend another month or two debating spending bills that should have been completed last September. The agencies and the States have waited long enough for Congress to act, and the President is submitting his 2008 budget request to us next week. It's time for Congress to complete this work.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of House Joint Resolution 20 to fund the essential services of the Federal Government through September 20 of this year.

On November 7, the American people voted to fire the former Republican majority for gross

mismanagement of the Nation's finances and woeful neglect of the priorities of the American people. This imperfect legislation is necessary to clean up the mess the former majority left behind.

Mr. Speaker, the former Republican majority passed only 2 of the 11 bills necessary to fund the discretionary accounts of the Federal Government. Failing to pass their obligatory legislation by October 1, 2006, the former majority passed a stopgap measure to keep the Government functioning when they adjourned the 109th Congress. Our new Democratic majority was left with the unfinished business of the fiscal year 2007 appropriations legislation. Today marks the 123rd day since the start of fiscal year 2007, and the President's 2008 budget request is scheduled to be delivered to this Congress on Monday. Now is the time to finish last year's work, so we can move on to the essential work at hand to deliver a new direction for the American people.

Although I am disappointed that funding priorities for our districts were left out of this bill, it is important to note several important improvements this bill makes over previous year's appropriations. For example, H.J. Res. 20 will raise the maximum Pell grant award from \$4,050 to \$4,310, the first increase in 4 years of this critical effort to make college more affordable for working families. The bill increases special education funding under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, by \$200 million. This Continuing Resolution will increase low-income public schools' Title I funding by \$125 million and thereby reverse the decline in Title I education funding. Even with these increases, Federal investment in education continues to lag far behind the levels needed to create a first-class school system for the 21st century, and I look forward to working to address these shortfalls in the fiscal year 2008 appropriations legislation.

I am concerned about the military construction projects left out of this legislation, and I want Congress to work on a bipartisan basis to address this problem in the fiscal year 2007 supplemental appropriations legislation. This bill includes an important increase of \$3.6 billion for veterans health care to meet the needs of an additional 325,000 patients, and it increases funding for health care services at the Department of Defense by \$1.2 billion, including treating soldiers wounded in action in Iraq and Afghanistan. The CR also increases funding for the basic allowance for military housing by \$500 million. Finally, the bill increases funding for intelligence analysts at the FBI that are critical to protect the American people from the terrorist threat as well as increasing funding for COPS local law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the House Budget Committee, I have learned over the past several weeks that the budget mess created by the former majority is far worse than the American people know. It will take a lot of hard work to restore order to our Nation's books. H.J. Res. 20 is the first necessary if unpleasant step in that vital effort. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Democrats' omnibus spending bill. The text of this legislation that would spend more than \$463.5 billion in taxpayer dollars was first distributed to the minority less than 48 hours ago and will

be debated for only one hour. In October the Democrats promised the American people increased transparency and accountability, but apparently, these promises are hard to keep in January.

While there are billions of dollars being spent without oversight or accountability, the omnibus also includes a provision that will alter the formula for distributing Section 8 housing funds. The current formula bases funding on an average of funding levels for May, June and July of 2004 with adjustments for inflation.

The altered formula contained in the omnibus bill will base funding levels on the previous twelve months funding, accounting for inflation. The formula change will cut significant amounts of funding for more than half of our nation's public housing authorities.

The formula change would result in a decrease in funding for three of the four major public housing authorities in my District. The Covington Housing Authority would lose \$197,321, the Ashland Public Housing Authority would lose \$75,578, and the Maysville Housing Authority would see a loss of \$71,274, which is 23.4 percent of its operating budget. These housing authorities provide critical services to my constituents and an unexpected funding cut like this will only worsen the already poorly funded public housing system.

Changing the formula for Section 8 is a topic that deserves debate, but the formula included in the Democrats' omnibus spending bill has yet to see the light of day in either the House Financial Services Committee or, until now, on the House floor. Changing the formula midway through the year without debate or discussion is an unwise move and would wreak havoc on our public housing system.

Contrary to claims made by Democratic leaders, it has been discovered that this bill contains numerous hidden earmarks that Democrats apparently hoped to ram through the House without debate. It is in the interest of the American people that we ask our colleagues across the aisle what else is buried in the 135 pages of this bill that will harm real people in our districts without ever having been debated in this House?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this omnibus appropriations bill we consider on the floor today is not a typical Continuing Resolution, but changes funding levels and re-prioritizes projects from prior years. This CR is the longest in recent history. Most of them are 1–2 pages. This is 137 pages. Some of these changes are controversial as well as complicated, and I feel that the whole House would have benefited from a thorough appraisal of these proposals, a vigorous committee process, so that all Members would have been fully apprised of the nuances and we could pass a wellthought out, carefully crafted omnibus spending bill. However, I was pleased that the crafters of this bill saw fit to include funding levels for Veterans' Affairs that come close to what the House Republicans passed in the last Congress, and funding levels close to the Administration's request. However, they should be higher. I do lament that the priorities of the current leadership to continue funding ineffective and wasteful programs have limited the amount of available funds that could improve the quality of life for our brave veterans even more.

For example, this bill does not eliminate 28 earmarks totaling \$70 million, including the

famed \$50 million Rainforest in Iowa project. That \$50 million could instead have been allocated to improving adaptive housing for disabled veterans. This bill also funds assistance to Independent States of the former Soviet Union at a level that is \$11 million above the Administration's request. Had this bill been considered in Committees, we may have been able to determine that this \$11 million excess may be better spent on rehabilitation programs for blind veterans. Finally, instead of allocating \$316 million for "Corporation for National and Community Service, Domestic Volunteer Service Programs," which includes funds to pay people to volunteer in the Americorps program. We could have used some of that money to increase the medical care for spinal cord injured veterans, or increasing benefits for survivors of service members who have sacrificed and given their lives in this Global War on Terror, defending the safety and freedom enjoyed by all of us back here in the States. This CR also breaks the Nation's obligation to provide soldiers and families adequate quality of life—affects the all volunteer force and unravels the Army's synchronized stationing and BRAC plan.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.J. Res. 20, the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution for Fiscal Year (FY) 2007. I commend Chairman OBEY and our House Leadership for bringing this Joint Resolution to the floor. While a Resolution such as this is not the ideal way to fund Government programs, the failure of the last Congress to complete its work left us with no viable alternative. In a very limited amount of time, the Appropriations Committee has done yeoman's work to bring the FY 2007 appropriations cycle to a close in the Resolution that is before us today.

Many difficult choices had to be made in this Joint Resolution. I am pleased that one of those choices was to fund highway, transit, and highway safety programs at the levels guaranteed by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Under H.J. Res. 20, highway programs will be funded at \$38.962 billion, an increase of \$3.411 billion over FY 2006 enacted levels; transit programs will be funded at \$8.975 billion, an increase of \$470 million over FY 2006; motor carrier safety programs will be funded at \$520.5 million, an increase of \$30 million over FY 2006; and highway safety programs will be funded at \$821 million, an increase of \$14 million over FY 2006.

These programs are funded by highway user revenues that have been deposited into the Highway Trust Fund, where they are held in trust for the purpose of meeting our surface transportation infrastructure needs. These needs are reaching crisis proportions. Congestion has worsened dramatically in recent years. In 2003, traffic congestion cost motorists \$63.1 billion in terms of wasted time and fuel.

In addition to meeting our infrastructure investment needs, the highway and transit funding levels set by this Joint Resolution will create an additional 192,000 family-wage construction jobs.

I would also like to mention one aviation-related matter. Under the previous Continuing Resolution, there was a technical anomaly that had the effect of reducing the amount of Airport Improvement Program contract authority

well below the intended program level. I am pleased that H.J. Res. 20 corrects this anomaly, and further, ensures that the full amount of contract authority that is authorized for the Airport Improvement Program in FY 2007 remains available. This will set the stage for a successful reauthorization of Federal aviation programs later this year, and I thank the Ap-

propriations Committee for their assistance in this matter.

All too often, long-term investments in our nation's infrastructure are short-changed in the face of the more immediate need to fund day-to-day operations. This Joint Resolution avoids such a short-sighted approach. Instead, it takes a longer-term view and recognizes the far-reaching effects transportation infrastruc-

ture investments have on our nation's economy, our competitiveness in the world marketplace, and the quality of life in our communities. Again, I applaud Chairman OBEY and House Leadership for recognizing the value of fully funding highway and transit programs, and I urge my colleagues to support the Joint Resolution.

COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF FY 2007 HIGHWAY FUNDING UNDER H.J. RES. 20 (SAFETEA-LU LEVELS) AND A FREEZE AT FY 2006 ENACTED FUNDING LEVELS*

State	Estimated FY 2007 based on FY 2006 enacted level	Estimated FY 2007 based on H. J. Res. 20	Increase in highway funds under H. J. Res. 20	Job gains
Alabama	548,699,954	600,869,788	52,169,834	2,478
Alaska	250,266,768	270,731,918	20,465,150	972
Arizona	538,528,974	593,277,405	54,748,431	2,601
Arkansas	347,184,100	381,949,909	34,765,809	1,651
California	2,408,038,182	2,680,526,468	272,488,286	12,943
Colorado	360,141,090	400,663,892	40,522,802	1,925
Connecticut	366,382,281	402,325,874	35,943,593	1,707
Delaware	109,353,384	121,131,724	11,778,340	559
District of Columbia	111,043,293	123,804,359	12,761,066	606
Florida	1,406,290,504	1,544,927,499	138,636,995	6,585
Georgia	969,691,811	1,067,010,791	97,318,980	4,623
Hawaii	115,267,040	127,596,268	12,329,228	586
Idaho	203,333,283	222,829,360	19,496,077	926
Illinois	910,387,767	1,010,811,302	100,423,535	4,770
Indiana	704,288,252	775,353,318	71,065,066	3,376
Iowa	295,143,803	330,589,700	35,445,897	1,684
Kansas	278,297,493	309,772,956	31,475,463	1,495
Kentucky	472,046,550	520,949,132	48,902,582	2,323
Louisiana	428,615,786	474,862,364	46,246,578	2,197
Maine	122,527,132	136,355,671	13,828,539	657
Maryland	441,365,185	490,032,577	48,667,392	2,312
Massachusetts	451,909,116	501,926,732	50,017,616	2,376
Michigan	821,004,265	909,761,902	88,757,637	4,216
Minnesota	437,257,769	485,442,279	48,184,510	2,289
Mississippi	329,837,415	367,059,847	37,222,432	1,768
Missouri	645,399,673	711,268,494	65,868,821	3,129
Montana	262,635,121	287,386,573	24,751,452	1,176
Nebraska	201,576,731	223,867,736	22,291,005	1,059
Nevada	189,509,480	210,350,302	20,840,822	990
New Hampshire	124,655,305	137,769,576	13,114,271	623
New Jersey	742,676,203	822,265,394	79,589,191	3,780
New Mexico	263,313,362	290,194,749	26,881,387	1,277
New York	1,235,368,254	1,366,155,757	130,787,503	6,212
North Carolina	790,657,686	872,183,722	81,526,036	3,872
North Dakota	170,820,553	189,098,718	18,278,165	868
Ohio	1,003,336,242	1,109,710,100	106,373,858	5,053
Oklahoma	417,430,679	459,904,524	42,473,845	2,018
Oregon	312,842,891	347,410,836	34,567,945	1,642
Pennsylvania	1,231,575,368	1,357,719,130	126,143,762	5,992
Rhode Island	138,243,095	154,154,462	15,911,367	756
South Carolina	463,551,501	511,384,433	47,832,932	2,272
South Dakota	183,777,294	202,845,805	19,068,511	906
Tennessee	608,526,292	672,761,834	64,235,542	3,051
Texas	2,336,793,323	2,574,558,747	237,765,424	11,294
Utah	198,304,703	220,645,255	22,340,552	1,061
Vermont	116,195,870	129,379,891	13,184,021	626
Virginia	752,517,077	830,852,486	78,335,409	3,721
Washington	464,963,105	519,595,013	54,631,908	2,595
West Virginia	297,110,356	325,592,845	28,482,489	1,353
Wisconsin	535,232,750	586,036,437	50,803,687	2,413
Wyoming	187,339,698	207,256,184	19,916,486	946
State Total	27,301,253,809	30,170,912,038	2,869,658,229	136,309
Allocated Programs	8,249,534,225	8,794,320,215	544,785,990	25,877
Grand Total	35,550,788,034	38,965,232,253	3,414,444,219	162,186

*Prepared by Transportation Committee Staff based on information provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Pursuant to FHWA estimates, the table assumes that \$1 billion of federal highway program investment creates or sustains 47,500 jobs.

COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF FY 2007 TRANSIT FUNDING UNDER H.J. RES. 20 (SAFETEA-LU LEVELS) AND A FREEZE AT FY 2006 ENACTED FUNDING LEVELS*

State	Estimated FY 2007 based on FY 2006 enacted level	Estimated FY 2007 based on H.J. Res. 20	Increase in transit funds under H.J. Res. 20
Alabama	34,196,079	35,917,557	1,721,478
Alaska	40,664,169	43,684,864	3,020,695
American Samoa	363,526	378,709	15,183
Arizona	70,874,803	74,566,555	3,691,752
Arkansas	20,595,782	21,624,106	1,028,325
California	860,977,967	909,011,398	48,033,431
Colorado	68,133,405	71,734,965	3,601,560
Connecticut	111,473,570	116,161,350	4,687,780
Delaware	12,343,553	12,964,684	621,131
District of Columbia	133,885,672	143,436,741	9,551,069
Florida	243,852,407	257,204,462	13,352,054
Georgia	122,588,444	129,936,520	7,348,076
Guam	826,259	860,325	34,067
Hawaii	29,830,942	31,400,084	1,569,142
Idaho	12,817,986	13,451,401	633,415
Illinois	398,577,515	416,783,541	18,206,026
Indiana	66,046,492	69,315,270	3,268,778
Iowa	25,968,993	27,268,158	1,299,165
Kansas	21,426,288	22,494,657	1,068,369
Kentucky	34,144,499	35,861,830	1,717,331
Louisiana	48,410,251	50,782,933	2,372,682
Maine	10,575,926	11,097,740	521,814
Maryland	138,222,300	145,473,348	7,251,048
Massachusetts	254,271,639	266,324,153	12,052,514
Michigan	97,312,254	102,276,279	4,964,026
Minnesota	71,558,372	75,538,579	3,980,208
Mississippi	18,738,808	19,670,220	931,412
Missouri	61,239,190	64,470,702	3,231,511
Montana	10,551,605	11,063,093	511,487
N. Mariana Islands	947,400	992,767	45,367
Nebraska	15,919,675	16,710,183	790,507

COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF FY 2007 TRANSIT FUNDING UNDER H.J. RES. 20 (SAFETEA-LU LEVELS) AND A FREEZE AT FY 2006 ENACTED FUNDING LEVELS*—Continued

State	Estimated FY 2007 based on FY 2006 enacted level	Estimated FY 2007 based on H.J. Res. 20	Increase in transit funds under H.J. Res. 20
Nevada	32,042,239	33,656,870	1,614,630
New Hampshire	10,102,458	10,578,619	476,161
New Jersey	400,436,239	419,100,009	18,663,771
New Mexico	19,119,184	20,069,956	950,771
New York	1,034,549,971	1,082,343,021	47,793,050
North Carolina	71,964,676	75,614,146	3,649,470
North Dakota	7,931,785	8,318,217	386,432
Ohio	139,489,673	146,321,569	6,831,896
Oklahoma	27,609,464	28,993,943	1,384,479
Oregon	58,396,279	61,754,430	3,358,151
Pennsylvania	292,172,210	304,365,432	12,193,221
Puerto Rico	61,813,245	65,063,169	3,249,924
Rhode Island	20,017,356	21,037,377	1,020,021
South Carolina	30,039,096	31,551,605	1,512,509
South Dakota	7,979,266	8,366,497	387,232
Tennessee	50,312,876	52,887,946	2,575,071
Texas	275,785,086	200,572,826	14,787,739
Utah	37,117,405	38,989,277	1,871,872
Vermont	4,741,909	4,970,440	228,531
Virgin Islands	1,075,588	1,124,292	48,704
Virginia	96,647,748	102,361,435	5,713,687
Washington	146,151,127	154,794,791	8,643,665
West Virginia	16,647,112	17,618,937	971,825
Wisconsin	58,738,414	61,751,045	3,012,631
Wyoming	6,369,396	6,673,663	304,268
State Subtotal	5,944,585,574	6,247,336,688	302,751,114
Oversight	42,456,256	44,626,313	2,170,057
Total	5,987,041,830	6,291,963,001	304,921,171
Tribal Transit Program	7,920,000	10,000,000	2,080,000
National RTAP	1,152,360	1,212,000	59,640
Grand Total	5,996,114,190	6,303,175,001	307,060,811

*Amounts shown above include total formula apportionments for non-urbanized formula (sec. 5311), state planning, metropolitan planning, elderly & disabled program (sec. 5310), new freedom, job access and reverse commute (JARC), rural transportation assistance program (RTAP), fixed guideway modernization, and urbanized area formula (sec. 5307) programs.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this massive \$463 billion dollar spending bill because it fails four critical tests: the accountability test, the common sense test, the compassion test, and most of all—the smell test.

Hatched behind close doors by the chairmen of the House and Senate appropriations committees with no input from Members or their constituents, H.J. Res. 20 levels a devastating blow against New Mexicans and their communities. Our most vulnerable low-income residents will pay the heaviest price.

As Deputy Ranking Member of the Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee, I wish to point out that the Majority's arbitrary choices are ripping nearly one million dollars away from the public housing authorities in my district and the people they serve; including \$272,428 from the Las Cruces Housing Authority; \$158,355 from the Dona Ana Housing Authority; \$30,461 from the Gallup Housing Authority; \$40,717 from the Truth or Consequences Housing Authority; \$15,076 from the Bernalillo Housing Authority; \$43,596 from the Los Lunas Housing Authority; and a combined total of \$416,173 from the Region V and Region II Housing Authorities.

A Section 8 voucher manager of one of my District's housing authorities described these drastic cuts as comparable to losing an entire month's worth of vouchers to the poor and needy families she serves. Another New Mexico housing authority representative stated that 100 families per month could lose access to vouchers in the region that housing authority serves.

The Majority's carelessly slung meat cleaver doesn't stop there. H.J. Res. 20 strips critical funding from the restoration of the Our Lady of Guadalupe Mission; essential economic development funding for a Business Park in Anthony-Berino; and desperately needed emergency ambulance services for the citizens of the Village of Columbus.

Two weeks ago, New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson and I announced our bipartisan determination to fight the dangerous scourge of methamphetamine use, production, and dis-

tribution in our state. Tragically, the Majority's ill-considered cuts will slash funding for the Drug Enforcement Administration Mobile Enforcement Teams (MET) by \$30 million and 134 agents and Regional Enforcement Teams (RET) by \$9 million and 23 agents. Our local and state law enforcement officers depend upon the MET and RET initiatives as two of their most effective tools in this fight. Many officers in my district have told me that even at current levels, MET funding is insufficient.

Perhaps the Majority's leadership has decided this battle isn't worth fighting. A few moments with the individuals and families whose lives this evil drug has destroyed might change their minds. But they don't seem to have the time to stop and think about how their choices will affect the safety of real people.

H.J. Res. 20 also reduces the funding associated with the Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) process by nearly \$4 billion, causing delays in the scheduled repositioning of the 1st Armored Division from Germany to Fort Bliss and the Air Force Special Operations Command from overseas to Cannon Air Force Base. The Majority's decision not only perpetuates inefficient overseas bases; it severely impacts the painstaking community development plans devised by cities like Las Cruces, Alamogordo, and Clovis in New Mexico.

Last, but certainly not least given the Majority's lip service in support of supplemental and alternative energy technologies, H.J. Res. 20 shreds funding for promising initiatives in this area. Consider, for example, a letter I submit for the RECORD from Karl Gawell of the Geothermal Energy Association. Mr. Gawell states that this legislation "will be a serious setback for efforts in the House and Senate to restore the DOE geothermal research program."

I have worked with Mr. Gawell to explore opportunities for expanded geothermal energy development in Southern New Mexico and I take his concerns very seriously. I hope that my colleagues will, too.

Mr. Speaker, as one who remains committed to vigorously fighting wasteful spending,

I understand—and share—the Majority's desire to eliminate unnecessary earmarks. A rushed and ham-handed bill designed for appearances isn't the right way to do it. My constituents deserve the chance to have their voices heard—an opportunity which the normal process of public hearings is designed to provide.

Certainly, H.J. Res. 20 contains positive elements, such as the significant increase it provides in funding for veterans. I wish I could vote yes for that reason alone—but I cannot support a bill that inflicts so much pain on so many New Mexicans in an indiscriminate and slipshod manner.

I urge my colleagues to join me in casting a "no" vote.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2007.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to express our serious concern about the direction being set by the FY 07 Appropriations bill, H.J. Res. 20, that the House will be considered tomorrow. This bill will be a serious setback for efforts in the House and Senate to restore the DOE geothermal research program.

While the bill includes a generic \$300 million increase in funding for renewable energy, it allows the Secretary of Energy to distribute those funds. Meanwhile, we are told that the base for funding will be the Administration's FY 07 request, which for geothermal energy was ZERO!

The House adopted an amendment last year to the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill sponsored by Representative Millender-McDonald appropriating \$5 million for geothermal research in FY 07, and the Senate Appropriations Bill as reported by Subcommittee and Committee would have restored the entire \$23.5 million geothermal program.

There is simply no justification for terminating geothermal energy research at the Department of Energy. Recent studies by the National Research Council, the Western Governors Association Clean Energy Task Force, and MIT all support expanding geothermal research funding to develop the technology necessary to utilize this vast, untapped domestic renewable energy resource.

We urge the House to take action to address this tragic situation as it considers the

FY 07 Appropriations bill and ensure continued funding for DOE's geothermal research efforts.

Sincerely,

KARL GAWELL,
Executive Director.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to express my support for the final passage of H.J. Res. 20, a joint funding resolution to provide continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2007. Let me be clear, although we have been able to take care of some of the most significant shortfalls, this is not a perfect funding resolution. This is also not the process that we would have preferred, because, as we all know, the funding for fiscal year 2007 should have been completed during the 109th session of Congress under the Republican majority.

With respect to the agencies included within the jurisdiction of the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee, a bipartisan attempt was made to address the most pressing needs. For example:

SBA disaster loans will receive \$114 million for administrative costs.

SBA Salaries and expenses will receive an additional \$17.7 million.

The District of Columbia will receive additional funds for public safety programs and \$20 million for public transportation.

Treasury will receive an additional \$26.6 million for high-priority anti-terror and financial intelligence analyst activities.

Judiciary will receive an additional \$179.1 million to avoid furloughs and support critical functions.

OPM Retirement Systems Modernization will receive \$13 million.

National Archives will receive \$7.7 million in additional funding for the Electronic Records Archive and \$3 million for repairs relating to the flooding of Archives headquarters.

Many important language provisions were also included in this resolution such as a continuation of resources to help rural communities, schools, and libraries afford telecommunications and information services. Without this language, funding would have to be cut or Universal Service fees would have to increase.

I was disappointed that we were unable to address the serious issue of privatized debt collection by the Internal Revenue Service, a practice that many Members have raised objections to continuing. I had also hoped to be able to address the HAVA funding that some states, including New York, may lose because of their inability to secure voting machines within the designated time frame. In addition, language provisions enacted in previous appropriations bills placing restrictions on how the District of Columbia is able to spend its own budget are, unfortunately, continued in this resolution.

However, I do intend to vote in favor of this Continuing Resolution. As I stated earlier, it is not perfect, but it is the best that we could do with the funds that we had. Beyond the immediate Financial Services agency issues, there was an attempt to write a resolution that addressed our nation's highest priority needs. Veterans Healthcare will receive \$32.3 billion, which is an increase of \$3.6 billion above the 2006 funding level. Defense Health Programs will receive \$21.2 billion, an increase of \$1.2 billion to provide care for our service members and their families. Providing health care for

our veterans and military personnel is the right thing to do. Significant numbers of our veterans are now returning from Iraq and Afghanistan and we have an obligation to provide funding for their health care needs.

I was pleased that additional funding was provided for Pell grants. This increased funding will help over 5.3 million of our students help to pay for ever increasing college costs. This Continuing Resolution also provided additional dollars for Head Start, a program that has proven its effectiveness. The National Institutes of Health received additional funds to support 500 more research project grants.

Our community health centers were allocated an increase of \$206.9 million to allow for the expansion or creation of over 300 health centers. These centers provide important health care services throughout the United States, and this funding will be utilized for priority health care needs. Ryan White CARE grants were increased to bring them to the authorized level. Finally, this resolution addresses important section 8 and public housing needs in our communities. All of these budget increases are a part of a carefully crafted resolution that attempts to address some of our nation's greatest needs.

I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.J. Res 20 so that it can go to the Senate and we can complete our work before our current resolution expires on February 15th. We will be receiving the President's 2008 budget next week, and as a Congress it is time to move forward and work on the 2008 funding needs for our government.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it is in the best interest of the country to play the blame game on how we reached the current appropriations situation. The fact of the matter is that the 109th Congress did not get its work done on time, and we are here today to correct that problem. Before we vote on this bill, I feel compelled to make a couple of observations. First and foremost, I want to thank Mr. OBEY and his staff for the hard work that they have put into this bill. Mr. OBEY faced an enormous task, and I believe that no matter how hard he tried, it would be impossible to address all of the funding needs.

However, I am concerned that despite all the rhetoric that the majority would work with the minority in crafting legislation, this bill was put together in the back room by the House and Senate majority, with little to no input from the minority. In addition, when discussing the nature of the CR, the majority stressed that this bill would not contain any earmarks. Yet, after negotiations were completed between the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, it appears that this bill will continue to fund a limited number of earmarks championed by the Senate. While these earmarks are technical in nature, and the case can be made that they should not be considered earmarks, the fact of the matter is that they are earmarks, and I believe that it is wrong for us to stand up and claim that this bill does not contain earmarks when it does.

Given that we are operating under a closed rule, and that it is unlikely that the Senate will remove their earmarks, I am resigned to the fact that it is unlikely that we will have an opportunity to change this legislation. Had we operated under regular order, I believe that a bipartisan Appropriations committee could have crafted a more balanced bill, which I would have been willing to support.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my constituents in the small rural town of Mendota, California.

I thank my friends Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS, and Chairman MOLLOHAN and Ranking Member WOLF for their hard work and specifically for including sufficient funding to complete the construction of the Mendota Federal Correction Institution.

Crowding at Federal medium-security facilities currently is 37 percent over capacity.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons expects 7,500 new Federal inmates annually.

Once constructed, Mendota would provide 1,552 beds to help address the growing demand.

The BOP has spent \$100 million to complete 40 percent of a prison in Mendota.

With this bill, the Federal Government is stepping up to a commitment that was made to California and Mendota by providing enough funds to complete the prison.

Mendota, is a city with an 18.6 percent unemployment rate and 42 percent living below the poverty line.

The prison will provide good jobs and a major boost to a very depressed local economy.

Again, thank you to my colleagues, completing Mendota is a sign that our new majority is committed to responsible governance.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Continuing Resolution and commend my colleagues in moving forward from the budgetary crisis left to us the 109th "Do-Nothing" Congress. I especially commend Chairman OBEY for the overall balance and fairness reflected in this CR given the difficult choices confronting him and the leadership in tackling such a complex fiscal policy challenge. I am pleased to see that key areas such as Veterans and Defense Health, Homeland Security, Transportation, Education and Social Security will be provided modest increases in funding to keep pace with inflation.

However, I am concerned that not fully funding BRAC will likely delay some projects—for example in my district, Fort Benning may not have the ability to undertake the new construction projects planned in conjunction with the growth resulting from the BRAC process.

Additionally, I recognize the explosion of congressional earmarks in recent years which funded special interest projects and promulgated negative perceptions about this legislative body. But the complete omission of earmarks on this year's CR is disconcerting. I am supportive of the process knowing that my district, which is among the poorest in the country, has benefited tremendously from earmarks. Specifically in my district, previously House-approved projects that stand to lose in the CR include funding for: hospitals; water management systems; family counseling and youth mentoring; cancer education and early detection; upgrading sewer systems; and the list goes on.

In many cases, the earmark process has provided an important vehicle for Members of Congress to direct much needed federal support to very worthy projects and organizations which otherwise would be ignored.

We must not throw the "baby out with the bathwater." Moving forward, I pledge to work closely with the leadership on real and effective reforms especially in regards to transparency, efficiency, accountability, and ethics.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the FY 2007 Continuing Resolution.

I am pleased to see that the Appropriations Committee followed the President's recommendations with the American Competitiveness Initiative by increasing funds to physical sciences research. The funding that we put into basic research at the National Science Foundation and the Departments of Energy and Commerce will pave the way for innovative breakthroughs. I am hopeful that the Senate will also prioritize these important science initiatives so that we can ensure that America remains globally competitive well into the future.

While many science accounts are adequately supported, the NASA account is not. H.J. Res. 20 reduces NASA's planned FY 2007 funding by \$545.3 million. Most of the savings come from the Exploration Systems account, the program that funds development of the next space vehicle. As this Congress understands, we need to retire the Space Shuttle in 2010 and introduce its successor shortly thereafter. The more we cut this budget item, the longer our nation must wait for continued manned access to space. At a time when countries like China and India are challenging America in outer space, we need to remain leaders in this field. We cannot do that if Congress does not adequately fund our ventures into space.

I am also disappointed that the Space Shuttle and International Space Station as well as the Space Science and Aeronautics programs are also underfunded.

It is for these reasons that I introduced an amendment yesterday to restore funding to NASA. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not accept any amendments to this bill, and Congress will not have the opportunity to vote on this important program. In the last Congress, we voted to support the Vision for Space Exploration and return to the Moon. If we are to live up to that promise, then we need to follow through with adequate appropriations. We also need to give our current programs the best chance to succeed.

I will work with Chairman BART GORDON and the appropriators to ensure that the Fiscal Year 2008 budget will adequately address our Nation's space and aeronautics needs.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of importance to my congressional district in Southwest Washington.

The White Pass Ski Area is located in the majestic Cascade Mountains in the Gifford Pinchot and Wenatchee National Forests. The area is commonly referred to by skiers as "the jewel of the Pacific Northwest" for its breathtaking views of Mt. Rainier and exciting skiing opportunities. The area, which provides critical tourism revenue to the surrounding rural communities, is now looking to expand to provide greater opportunities to skiers in the Pacific Northwest.

The Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 added over 23,000 acres of land to the Goat Rocks Wilderness Area and removed from wilderness designation 800 acres adjacent to the White Pass Ski Area as having "significant potential for ski development" and urging the Secretary of Agriculture to "utilize this potential, in accordance with applicable laws, rules and regulations."

The Gifford Pinchot National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan allocated the

800-acre area that Congress had withdrawn from the Wilderness Area back in 1984 to Developed Recreation in recognition of the intent of Congress. However, the LRMP concurrently inventoried as roadless the same 800-acre area.

It is well-understood that it was congressional intent to permit expansion of the White Pass Ski Area. I would like to submit for the record a letter signed by all living Members of the 1984 congressional delegation, stating that it was their intent to provide for the expansion of White Pass Ski Area. In a February 3, 2004 letter, the U.S. Department of Agriculture also confirmed this congressional intent, stating: "We agree that the intent of Congress was clearly to allow for ski area development in the Hogback Basin."

The Fiscal Year 2007 Interior Appropriations Bill that passed the House in May of last year included important information clarifying congressional intent to permit expansion of White Pass Ski Area. The language stated:

The Committee notes that the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 removed from wilderness designation 800 acres of land adjacent to the White Pass Ski Area in Washington State for potential ski development. The Committee notes that the Gifford Pinchot National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan allocated the 800-acre area as Developed Recreation to allow for ski area expansion, while concurrently inventorying the same land as roadless to reflect its current physical character. The Committee recognizes that it was the intent of Congress to permit ski area expansion into this 800-acre area and urges the Secretary of Agriculture, once the Environmental Impact Statement for the White Pass Ski Area's Master Development Plan is properly completed, to move forward expeditiously in approving the expansion plans in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

Unfortunately, the Continuing Resolution that we are going to pass today does not include any report language, including the language clarifying congressional intent as it relates to White Pass Ski Area.

I wanted to bring this issue to the attention of my colleagues and highlight the fact that the House Appropriations Committee was prepared and willing to clarify congressional intent, and that the full House approved that clarification by voting for the Fiscal Year 2007 Interior Appropriations Bill in May. In keeping with this, I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to move forward expeditiously in approving the expansion plans in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations—once the Environmental Impact Statement is properly completed.

JULY 7, 2005.

MIKE JOHANNIS,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY JOHANNIS: As members of the 1984 Washington Congressional delegation, we are writing to express our collective dismay over an injustice that has continued over the past 21 years.

Over two decades ago, we succeeded in passing through the Congress the Washington Wilderness Act of 1984 (Washington Wilderness Act; P.L. 98-339). This legislation added 23,000 acres of wilderness along and near Highway 12, while removing from wilderness designation 800 acres that are adjacent to the White Pass Ski Area. As reported language stated, legislation removed the 800

acres from wilderness so the Secretary of Agriculture could evaluate its "significant potential for ski area development."

Now, twenty one years after passage of this Act, the White Pass Ski Area remains mired down in its third attempt at completing an Environmental Impact Study to add these acres. Something has gone terribly wrong.

The White Pass Ski Area, which began operations in 1952, is located at the crest of the Cascade Mountains in south-central Washington State within the boundaries of the Wenatchee-Okanagan and Gifford Pinchot National Forests. Plans for expansion of the White Pass Ski Area were first initiated in the late 1950's and included the Hogback Basin.

In 1961, the White Pass Company submitted to the Forest Service a survey and formal request for additional expansion area on the north slope of Hogback Mountain, and requested it not be incorporated within the anticipated wilderness boundary. The Forest Service concurred with the proposed boundary adjustments.

However, these discussions were not brought forward during Congressional evaluation of the proposed wilderness legislation. The Wilderness Act of 1964 (PL 88-577) subsequently incorporated the Goat Rocks Wild Area, including most of Hogback Basin, into the National Wilderness Preservation System as the Goat Rocks Wilderness. Despite the incorporation of the proposed expansion area into the Goat Rocks Wilderness, discussions concerning White Pass expansion plans and the need for a boundary adjustment continued over the next 20 years.

In the early 1980's supporters of the ski area approached Congress to lobby for a wilderness boundary adjustment during the days preceding passage of the 1984 Washington Wilderness Act. Environmental interests were concerned with the precedent created by adjusting the Wilderness boundary, but "agreed with the expansion of downhill skiing opportunities in exchange for significant expansion of Goat Rocks . . ." (Sid Morrison letter to Supervisor O'Neal April 17, 1989).

The purpose of the 1984 Washington Wilderness Act were to "(1) designate certain National Forest System lands in the state of Washington as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, . . . and (2) insure that certain other National Forest System lands in the State of Washington be available for non-wilderness multiple uses." (PL 98-336, Sec 2(b)(1 and 2) Through the 1984 legislation, some 23,000 acres of land were added to the Goat Rocks Wilderness while 800 acres were released from the wilderness area (refer to Goat Rocks Add. West Side map #WA-W-109, March 1984).

The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Report (98-461) describing the legislation and its objectives provides further explanation of the wilderness release language in the Act. "As reported, S. 837 would add approximately 23,143 acres to the existing Goat Rocks Wilderness established by Congress in 1964. In addition, some 800 acres would be deleted from the existing wilderness. The 800 acres deleted from the existing Goat Rocks Wilderness Area have significant potential for ski development and should be managed by the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize this potential, in accordance with applicable laws, rules and regulations (Senate Rpt. 98-461, page 10)."

The dilemma is that, because of multiple land use designations for the proposed expansion area, in combination with other procedural issues, efforts to approve expansion plans have been repeatedly thwarted. The conflicting, confusing and uncertain status of the subject lands needs addressing.

The need for administrative action with respect to the White Pass Ski Area expansion

project is evident from the 40-year history of expansion attempts. Maintaining this area in a non-developed recreation status is not consistent with the intent of Congress. Over the past 21 years, various actions have continually frustrated the intent of Congress to allow for the potential expansion of White Pass Ski Area.

In order to prevent the failure of a third attempt to resolve the expansion need, White Pass is committed to complete another NEPA analysis. Based on findings from the analysis, we the undersigned strongly urge the current Washington Congressional delegation and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a vehicle for the White Pass Company to expand into Hogback Basin without further delay and the threat of costly appeals and judicial reviews.

We hope that you will agree that the conflicting, confusing and uncertain status of the subject lands deserve your thoughtful clarification, correction and resolution.

Sincerely,

Sid Morrison, U.S. Congressman 4th District, Mike Lowry, Governor, U.S. Congressman, 7th District, Slade Gorton, U.S. Senator, Al Swift, U.S. Congressman 2nd District, Don Bonker, U.S. Congressman 3rd District, Norm Dicks, U.S. Congressman 6th District, Dan Evans, U.S. Senator, Governor, Tom Foley, U.S. Congressman 5th District.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 109th Congress, Republicans adjourned for the year without completing work on 9 of the 11 budget bills that fund the operations of the federal government. Completion of the federal government's annual budget is one of Congress' most critical tasks, but even though several months have gone by since the beginning of the fiscal year, only 2 of the 11 bills for fiscal year 2007—Defense and Homeland Security Appropriations—have been signed into law.

This failure to complete Congress' most basic task—to pay the country's bills—has left newly elected leaders of the House and the Senate with no choice but to make tough choices with regard to the fiscal year 2007 budget.

Since October 2006, the federal government has been operating on the basis of a temporary measure known as a continuing resolution. This resolution is set to expire on February 15, 2007, and unless Congress approves funding for federal programs covering Agriculture; Commerce, Justice, and Science; Energy and Water; Foreign Operations; Interior and the Environment; Labor, Health & Human Services, and Education; Legislative Branch; Military Construction and Veterans Affairs; and Transportation, Treasury, and Housing, federal government operations in these areas will cease.

Over the past weeks, House leaders have been writing legislation that would ensure the federal government remains operational through fiscal year 2007. Today, the House is considering H.J. Res. 20, a joint resolution that will keep the federal government open and require most federal programs to operate under tight budget constraints. While modest increases were allotted to some of America's high priority items, such as veterans' and military health care, law enforcement, and education, the bill cuts over 60 federal programs and rescinds unobligated balances on many other programs to pay for them. Further, the bill explicitly eliminates special funding provisions, commonly referred to as "earmarks."

H.J. Res. 20 is not a perfect bill, and I am concerned about how it might impact some federal programs that are important to Missouri residents. Despite my concerns, I have concluded that it is in our nation's best interest to quickly approve this appropriations package and focus our attention toward the President's fiscal year 2008 budget and the President's anticipated supplemental appropriations request for military efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. I commend Congressman OBEY for drafting such complex legislation that makes the best of a bad situation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the funding recommendations for accounts under the jurisdiction of the Defense Subcommittee.

The House approved the conference report on the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007 on September 26th, 2006 by a vote of 394 to 22, and the President signed the bill into law on September 29th. However, several important accounts that were previously within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life have been transferred back to the Defense Subcommittee, and therefore are addressed in this continuing resolution.

Two of the most important of these are the Basic Allowance of Housing for our active duty members of the military, and the Defense Health Program.

I am pleased this continuing resolution provides the minimum funding level necessary for both these activities. This legislation provides an increase of \$500 million for Basic Allowance for House above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level, and an increase of \$1.2 billion for the Defense Health Program.

However, we need to recognize that both programs will need additional funds during the rest of this fiscal year. Rates for Basic Allowance for Housing were increased late last year following the normal survey of market housing rates. This has created a shortfall of \$1.4 billion.

In addition, due to inflationary increases in health care costs and an Administration proposal for an increase in insurance co-payments that was not approved by the Congress, the Defense Health Program faces an additional shortfall of at least \$700 million.

We must address these funding shortfalls later this year. Our highest priority in the Defense budget should be for the well-being of our military personnel, and I know my Subcommittee chairman shares my concerns. This continuing resolution is just a first step toward meeting that responsibility in fiscal year 2007.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 116, the joint resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit with instructions at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes, I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommit the joint resolution, H. J. Res. 20, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 26, line 2, strike "\$3,902,556,000" and insert "\$3,977,556,000".

On page 26, line 6, strike "\$3,726,778,000" and insert "\$3,926,778,000".

On page 33, line 5, strike "\$6,275,103,000" and insert "\$5,875,103,000".

On page 33, line 5, strike "and" and on line 6, before the period, insert the following:

"; and 'Fossil Energy Research and Development', \$542,314,000".

On page 39, after line 24, insert the following new sections:

"Sec. 20327. Notwithstanding section 101, the level for 'Independent Agencies, Denali Commission' shall be \$2,500,000.

"Sec. 20328. Of the funds appropriated under section 130 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199) under the heading 'Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Science', as amended by section 315 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103) for the Iowa Environmental and Education project in Coralville, Iowa, \$44,569,000 is hereby deobligated and rescinded.

On page 54, line 18, strike "\$2,670,730,000" and insert "\$2,663,855,000".

On page 62, line 3, strike "\$6,883,586,000" and insert "\$6,844,303,000".

On page 64, after line 13, insert the following:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the twelfth proviso under the heading 'Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services' in the Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2006 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

On page 79, after line 2, insert the following:

"Sec. 20646. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, section 105 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-149) shall not apply to funds appropriated by this division.

On page 84, line 17, strike "\$2,013,000,000" and insert "\$2,053,017,000".

On page 85, line 23, strike "\$579,000,000" and insert "\$594,991,000".

On page 85, line 24, strike "\$671,000,000" and insert "\$676,829,000".

On page 86, line 2, strike "\$505,000,000" and insert "\$509,126,000".

On page 86, line 3, strike "\$1,168,000,000" and insert "\$1,183,138,000".

On page 86, line 4 strike "\$750,000,000" and insert "\$755,071,000".

On page 90, line 13, strike "\$1,737,412,000" and insert "\$1,787,412,000".

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is intended to eliminate earmarks to fund a variety of important Federal programs. In spite of those best intentions, however, a close reading of the bill revealed that earmarks were, in fact, left in.

Additionally, a number of critical programs affecting new law enforcement, military construction and military families have been shortchanged. In an effort to live up to the spirit of what this bill intended, my motion to recommit would eliminate nearly \$600 million in earmarks, other unnecessary spending, and also use those funds to fully fund the Drug Enforcement Administration's effort to combat methamphetamines and other illicit drugs, restore critically needed funds to military construction and military family housing accounts, and reduce the Federal deficit.

Specifically, this motion would accomplish the following:

First, rescind the remaining \$44.6 million from the Senate's rain forest in Iowa earmark, eliminate \$94 million unnecessary and unrequested funding for the Denali Commission, funding that is nothing more than a thinly-disguised Senate earmark for Alaska. Eliminate \$400 million of ongoing earmarks from the NNSA weapons activity accounts. Eliminate \$49.7 million of spending in DOE's fossil energy account, spending that duplicates mandatory funding by the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

My motion would distribute these savings in the following manner:

First, \$50 million for the DEA's efforts to combat meth and other illicit drugs; \$275 million for basic allowance for housing; \$86 million for critically needed military construction and family housing; \$178 million for deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to live up to the spirit of this legislation by voting to eliminate earmarks and put those funds to better use by combating meth, supporting our military families and reducing the deficit.

I urge a strong bipartisan vote on this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time may remain to Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Republican motion to recommit.

Last year, I held nearly 40 town hall meetings across New Mexico talking to our local communities about combating methamphetamine use in our towns. Twenty of these meetings were in schools with our school kids, and we found that five times the national average of kids in New Mexico are addicted to methamphetamines, up to 15 percent of our elementary and high school students are already addicted.

Two weeks ago, New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson and I announced our bipartisan determination to fight

the dangerous scourge of methamphetamine use, production and distribution in our State. Tragically, the majority's ill-considered cuts will slash funding for the Drug Enforcement Administration Mobile Enforcement Teams, the MET teams, by \$30 million and 134 agents, and Region Enforcement Teams, the RETs, by \$9 million and 23 agents.

Our local and State law enforcement officers depend on the MET and RET initiative as two of the most effective tools in this fight. Many officers in my district have told me that even at current level of funding, MET is insufficient.

Perhaps the majority leadership has decided battles against illegal drugs are not worth fighting. A few moments with the individuals and families who I met with in my 20 school meetings and 19 additional town hall meetings might change their minds. But we did not seem to have time to consider the people and the effects on the lives of kids in the real America that we face today. We were explained, well, maybe we made a few mistakes. Do tell. We made mistakes that affect the lives of the young people of this Nation and the heart and the soul of this country.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit. Work with us to protect and defend the families of New Mexico and all of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this is simply a nit-picking motion which, if adopted, would kill our chances of passing this resolution in the United States Senate and result in us living on an '06 continuing resolution, which would deny us the ability to provide additional funds for veterans health care, for education, for veterans housing and the like.

I would point out, this resolution already adds \$500 million to the basic allowance for housing. This CR already increases family housing construction by \$210 million and funds military construction at the level of the President's request that have been authorized.

This motion would eliminate the weapons research account that has been of some controversy today. I would point out, we have already cut that account by \$94 million. I doubt that the House wants to eliminate that nuclear weapons research.

I would also say that in a new found and sudden burst of false piety, we are now being chastised because we did not reach back and eliminate an item that was approved 2 years ago for the State of Iowa by the majority. In fact, the gentleman who was chairman of the committee when that item was approved is none other than the gentleman offering the motion right now.

I don't mind clearing up the mistakes for last year, of the gentleman, I do mind being asked to go back 2 years to clear up your mistakes. That is asking too much, even for us.

Secondly, I would say that some of us may not like the Denali Commission, but it is a perfectly authorized program. And as much as I might like to see a project like that in my district, I don't have one, neither does the gentleman. I think it is illegitimate for us to single out one legitimate program for elimination that would require us, I think in the interest of fairness, to go back and look at hundreds of other programs that have been approved in the past. So I urge a "no" vote.

□ 1515

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of House Joint Resolution 20, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 5.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 228, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—196

Aderholt	Conaway	Graves
Akin	Crenshaw	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Culberson	Hayes
Baker	Davis (KY)	Heller
Barrett (SC)	Davis, David	Hensarling
Barrow	Davis, Tom	Herger
Bartlett (MD)	Deal (GA)	Hobson
Barton (TX)	Dent	Hoekstra
Biggart	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hulshof
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hunter
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Drake	Issa
Blackburn	Dreier	Jindal
Blunt	Duncan	Johnson (IL)
Boehner	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Bonner	Emerson	Jones (NC)
Bono	English (PA)	Jordan
Boozman	Everett	Kanjorski
Boustany	Fallin	Keller
Brady (TX)	Feeney	King (IA)
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	King (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Flake	Kingston
Ginny	Forbes	Kirk
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Kline (MN)
Burgess	Fossella	Knollenberg
Burton (IN)	Fox	Kuhl (NY)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	LaHood
Camp (MI)	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Campbell (CA)	Gallely	Latham
Cannon	Garrett (NJ)	LaTourette
Cantor	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Capito	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Carter	Gingrey	Linder
Castle	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Chabot	Goode	Lucas
Coble	Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Cole (OK)	Granger	E.

Feeney	Lungren, Daniel
Flake	E.
Forbes	Mack
Fortenberry	Marchant
Fox	McCarthy (CA)
Franks (AZ)	McCaul (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McCrery
Gallely	McHenry
Garrett (NJ)	McKeon
Gillmor	Mica
Gingrey	Miller (FL)
Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Granger	Musgrave
Hall (TX)	Myrick
Hayes	Neugebauer
Heller	Nunes
Hensarling	Pearce
Herger	Pence
Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Hoekstra	Pickering
Hulshof	Pitts
Hunter	Poe
Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)
Issa	Putnam
Jordan	Radanovich
Kanjorski	Regula
King (IA)	Rehberg
Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Kline (MN)	Rogers (KY)
Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
LaHood	Roskam
Lamborn	Royce
LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Lewis (CA)	Sali
Lewis (KY)	Saxton
Linder	Sensenbrenner
Lucas	Sessions

Shadegg Terry Weldon (FL)
Shimkus Thornberry Westmoreland
Smith (NE) Tiahrt Whitfield
Smith (TX) Tiberi Wicker
Souder Turner Wilson (SC)
Stearns Walberg Wolf
Sullivan Walden (OR) Young (AK)
Tancred Wamp Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander Gilchrest McDermott
Buyer Hastert Norwood
Davis, Jo Ann Higgins Paul

□ 1550

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIRE A VETERAN WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 5.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 5, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie Burgess DeGette
Aderholt Burton (IN) Delahunt
Akin Butterfield DeLauro
Allen Calvert Dent
Altmire Campbell (CA) Diaz-Balart, L.
Andrews Cannon Diaz-Balart, M.
Arcuri Cantor Dicks
Baca Capito Dingell
Bachmann Capps Doggett
Bachus Capuano Donnelly
Baird Cardoza Doolittle
Baker Carnahan Doyle
Baldwin Carney Drake
Barrett (SC) Carson Dreier
Barrow Carter Duncan
Bartlett (MD) Castle Edwards
Barton (TX) Castor Ehlers
Bean Chabot Ellison
Becerra Chandler Ellsworth
Berkley Clarke Emanuel
Berman Clay Emerson
Berry Cleaver Engel
Biggert Clyburn English (PA)
Bilbray Coble Eshoo
Billirakis Cohen Etheridge
Bishop (GA) Cole (OK) Everett
Bishop (NY) Conaway Fallon
Bishop (UT) Conyers Farr
Blackburn Cooper Fattah
Blumenauer Costa Feeney
Blunt Costello Ferguson
Boehner Courtney Filner
Bonner Cramer Flake
Bono Crenshaw Forbes
Boozman Crowley Fortenberry
Boren Cubin Fossella
Boswell Cuellar Foxx
Boucher Culberson Frank (MA)
Boustany Cummings Franks (AZ)
Boyd (FL) Davis (AL) Frelinghuysen
Boyd (KS) Davis (CA) Gallegly
Brady (PA) Davis (IL) Garrett (NJ)
Braley (IA) Davis (KY) Gerlach
Brown (SC) Davis, David Giffords
Brown, Corrine Davis, Lincoln Gillibrand
Brown-Waite, Davis, Tom Gillmor
Ginny Deal (GA) Gingrey
Buchanan DeFazio Gonzalez

Goode Matheson Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte Matsui Salazar
Gordon McCarthy (CA) Sali
Granger McCarthy (NY) Sanchez, Linda
Graves McCaul (TX) T.
Green, Al McCollum (MN) Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene McCotter Sarbanes
Grijalva McCreery Saxton
Gutierrez McGovern Schakowsky
Hall (NY) McNulty Schiff
Hall (TX) McHugh Schmidt
Hare McIntyre Schwartz
Harman McKeon Scott (GA)
Hastings (FL) McMorris Scott (VA)
Hayes Rodgers Sensenbrenner
Heller McNeerney Serrano
Herger McNulty Sessions
Herseth Meehan Sestak
Hill Meek (FL) Shadegg
Hinchey Meeks (NY) Shays
Hinojosa Melancon Shea-Porter
Hirono Mica Sherman
Hodes Michaud Shimkus
Hoekstra Millender Shuler
Holden McDonald Shuster
Holt Miller (FL) Simpson
Honda Miller (MI) Sires
Hoolley Miller (NC) Skelton
Hoyer Miller, Gary Slaughter
Hulshof Miller, George Smith (NE)
Inglis (SC) Mitchell Smith (NJ)
Inslee Mollohan Smith (TX)
Israel Moore (KS) Smith (WA)
Issa Moore (WI) Snyder
Jackson (IL) Moran (KS) Solis
Jackson-Lee Moran (VA) Souder
(TX) Murphy, Patrick Space
Jefferson Murphy, Tim Spratt
Jindal Musgrave Stark
Johnson (GA) Myrick Stearns
Johnson (IL) Nadler Stupak
Johnson, E. B. Napolitano Sullivan
Johnson, Sam Neal (MA) Sutton
Jones (NC) Neugebauer Tancred
Jones (OH) Nunes Tanner
Jordan Oberstar Tauscher
Kagen Obey Taylor
Kanjorski Olver Terry
Kaptur Ortiz Thompson (CA)
Keller Pallone Thompson (MS)
Kennedy Pascarelli Thornberry
Kildee Pastor Tiahrt
Kilpatrick Payne Tiberi
Kind Pearce Tierney
King (IA) Pence Towns
King (NY) Perlmutter Turner
Kingston Peterson (MN) Udall (CO)
Kirk Peterson (PA) Udall (NM)
Klein (FL) Petri Upton
Kline (MN) Pickering Van Hollen
Knollenberg Pitts Velázquez
Kucinich Platts Poe
Kuhl (NY) Kuhl (NY) Visclosky
Lamborn Pomeroy Walberg
Lambson Price (GA) Walden (OR)
Langevin Price (NC) Walsh (NY)
Lantos Pryce (OH) Walz (MN)
Larsen (WA) Putnam Wasserman
Larson (CT) Radanovich Schultz
Latham Rahall Waters
LaTourette Ramstad Watson
Lee Rangel Watt
Levin Regula Waxman
Lewis (CA) Rehberg Weiner
Lewis (GA) Reichert Welch (VT)
Lewis (KY) Renzi Weldon (FL)
Linder Reyes Weller
Lipinski Reynolds Westmoreland
LoBiondo Rodriguez Wexler
Loeb sack Rogers (AL) Whitfield
Lofgren, Zoe Rogers (KY) Wicker
Lucas Rogers (MI) Wilson (NM)
Lungrén, Daniel Rohrabacher Wilson (OH)
E. Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (SC)
Lynch Roskam Wolf
Mack Ross Woolsey
Mahoney (FL) Rothman Wu
Maloney (NY) Roybal-Allard Wynn
Manzullo Royce Yarmuth
Marchant Ruppersberger Young (AK)
Markey Rush Young (FL)
Marshall Ryan (OH)

NOT VOTING—23

Ackerman Davis, Jo Ann Hensarling
Alexander Gilchrest Higgins
Brady (TX) Gohmert Hobson
Buyer Hastert Hunter
Camp (MI) Hastings (WA) LaHood

Lowey Murtha
McDermott Norwood
Murphy (CT) Paul

□ 1558

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unduly delayed for the vote on H. Con. Res. 5, Expressing the Support for the designation and goals of "Hire a Veteran Week." Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea" on H. Con. Res. 5.

The Armed Services provide invaluable experience to the men and women who serve this great nation. With this experience, veterans are an extremely valuable asset to our workforce in Southern Nevada and throughout the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend rollcall votes today, January 31, 2007. I would like to enter into the RECORD how I intended to vote on the missed rollcall votes:

On roll No. 64, On a Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H. Res. 59, Supporting the goals and ideas of National Engineers Week, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 65, On a Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H. Con. Res. 34, Honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 66, On Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 16, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 67, On Agreeing to the Resolution on H. Res. 16, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 68, On Consideration of the Joint Resolution for H.J. Res. 20, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 69, On Tabling the Motion to Reconsider re H.J. Res. 20, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 70, On Tabling the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair re H.J. Res. 20, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 71, On the Motion to Recommit with Instructions re H.J. Res. 20, I would have voted "no."

On roll No. 72, On Passage of H.J. Res. 20, I would have voted "yes."

On roll No. 73, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H. Con. Res. 5, Establishing Hire A Veteran Week, I would have voted "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks during debate on H.J. Res. 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for information about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension. There will be no votes, however, until 6:30.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 for morning hour business and noon for legislative business. We will consider additional bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of the suspension bills for the week will be announced later this week.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10. In addition to suspension bills, we will consider H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. Now, because we have come to a point where, as you know, the committees have just recently been fully organized, they are starting to have hearings but because we have not produced as much legislation, we have been dealing with a lot of work so far, I know the gentleman will be upset and my colleagues will be upset that they will have to work at home on Friday.

I want to reiterate that. When Members are home, they are working. They are listening to their constituents. They are having town meetings. They are attending meetings. They are attending the chamber of commerce or the Lion's Club or the Rotary or the PTA.

So that, although we will not be here on Friday, I want to assure the public that I know, I know that Mr. BLUNT knows and every Member here knows that when they are not here, they are in their home, they are working on behalf of their constituents. So we will not be here on Friday as scheduled because the flow of work will not be ready for Friday that we can go through the regular order.

As I have told the gentleman and his colleagues, we really do want to get to the regular order so that there are opportunities to consider bills in committees, report them through the Rules Committee, amend them on the floor and proceed as both sides, I think, would like.

□ 1600

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information.

I don't want to belabor the point. I certainly do want to join him in sharing this sense of how hard our Members do work and where they work. We talked about this at great length a couple of weeks ago. And I think the early discussion of being on the floor of the House 5 days every single week was widely enjoyed by the late-night comedians and others. And I said at that time, and I still believe, our problem is not that the Members of Congress don't work 5 days a week.

Frankly, our problem is that too many Members of Congress work 7 days

a week. And on those times when we don't have work in Washington and can be in the district, people want to meet with Members in their office. It does give Members a chance to, during the normal workweek, relate to people, activities, and ongoing events that they otherwise can't relate to. I think almost all of our Members are more than willing to take time on a Saturday to meet with people who normally work Monday through Friday. Frankly, most of the people that you would want to meet with see that as a much greater imposition than the Members of Congress who really do work more than 5 days a week at home and in Washington. The work of the Congress is important work, and it doesn't all occur here on the floor of the House while we are voting, nor does it all occur in Washington.

I would like to yield to my friend, the ranking member on the Rules Committee. He has an observation, I think.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I congratulate both the majority leader and the distinguished minority whip for recognizing especially those of us who are in California.

I have a whole series of meetings that I am going to be holding in California in the next couple of days, and it has been virtually impossible to hold any kind of weekday meeting with constituents because of the challenges that we have faced over the past month.

And I know that our 3-hour workdays and then the half hour on a Friday have made it important to note that we have been working here, but it has made it virtually impossible to be able to hold, as I said, any weekday meetings in California.

I would like to just raise a question, Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished majority leader about the issue of the schedule for next week. Now, it is my understanding that the legislation that we are scheduled to consider in the Rules Committee may come up under an open amendment process, allowing us an opportunity to have amendments proposed on the floor. The thing that concerns me is that while we have had a wide range of measures brought to the floor under suspension of the rules, I have looked back at this legislation that we are going to be addressing next week, and while it will be wonderful to have an open amendment process, it will be great if that, in fact, is going to be decided by the Rules Committee, it will be a wonderful thing to be seeing, but the fact is when this legislation was last considered, it was considered under suspension of the rules and passed unanimously without a recorded vote. A voice vote, in fact, was all that was necessary.

So I will, just for the record, Mr. Speaker, say to the distinguished majority leader, and I thank the distinguished minority whip for yielding to me, that I am concerned about the notion of utilizing an open amendment

process on a matter that is non-controversial and very easily could be considered under suspension of the rules if it is being done solely for the purpose of saying, aha, we have moved beyond closed rules and we are now considering issues under an open amendment process when, in fact, there may not even be any amendments proposed because when this last came before us, it was considered under suspension of the rules.

I thank my friend for yielding, and if you would like to yield to the majority leader to respond.

Mr. BLUNT. I would be pleased to yield to my friend, the majority leader, for a response to that.

Mr. HOYER. I will say to my friend this is such a difficult process on this side of the aisle. We considered last week a piece of legislation, and one of your Members went to the Rules Committee and asked for an amendment. We gave him an amendment, and then he wrote, apparently, and it caused a great deal of controversy, that we allowed the amendment and he really didn't want the amendment.

So then we came to the floor with the amendment still allowed. Of course, he didn't have to offer it. Nobody was forcing him to offer it. But there was great consternation that we had allowed the amendment and, indeed, a substitute, which you apparently didn't want either. So it is very difficult for us. Now we bring a bill that has an open rule and it is so lacking in controversy that it ought to be perhaps a closed rule or a suspension.

We will try to figure out what you really want, and when we do, we will try to do something that pleases you. We are having difficulty so far.

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think the point my good friend from California is making, and I would like to emphasize, is we hope we are now moving to rules that are open when possible, that allow amendments when an open rule is not possible. I think the point he was making was that hopefully this just isn't to go on the record and say, as my good friend just did, well, once we allowed you an amendment that the Member decided he didn't want and then you complained about that. We don't want this to be cited as, well, don't you remember the time we gave you the open rule on a bill that passed unanimously without amendment in the last Congress? It is time to move on.

My good friend from Maryland knows my high regard for him, and I am going to do my very best, at these weekly opportunities to talk about the schedule, to not just complain about the process. But I do know that my friend, who has been here longer than I have and understands and appreciates the process in the House, knows that it is to everybody's advantage if we get to the place where we are debating these bills, where the ideas that are brought to the floor can stand the challenge of debate and amendment, and we need to get

there. As I said last week, I am prepared to look forward, as disappointed as I was about the way the previous few weeks have been handled, but there are only so many weeks that you can just be satisfied to think that, well, I am hopeful that next week will be better, and I guess here we would be hopeful that the open rule would not just be the example of the open rule we got on this kind of bill, but the beginning of real debate and real opportunity to amend in this Congress.

I would like to yield again to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say to the majority leader that I didn't bring up the issue of process, but since my very good friend and classmate from Maryland did bring up the issue of process, pointing to the fact that an amendment was made in order even when that Member did not want to have the amendment made in order, which was clearly stated in a letter that was submitted to the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, recognizing that that was an unprecedented move, because I will tell you, having served as chairman of the Rules Committee, time and time again, we would have Members testify before the Rules Committee, making a request that amendments be made in order, and then we would get a letter from that Member asking that that amendment be withdrawn, and every time we would immediately disseminate that.

So the only reason that there was a great deal of consternation on the issue that my friend has raised is that the action that was taken by the Rules Committee was completely unprecedented. In fact, in all the research that we did, we were never able to find any instance that ever before, under either the Democratic majority or the Republican majority, had action like that been taken. So that led us to be concerned. Similarly, as we look at the prospect of moving ahead with very important legislation that passed unanimously without any amendment, I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that to simply use, as the distinguished minority whip has said, that as an argument to say we provided open rules is, I think, a little bit of a stretch.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California. Of course, the gentleman to which he refers, as he knows, voted for the rule. In addition, as the gentleman knows, we gave your side the opportunity to have unanimous consent to amend the rule. You chose not to ask for that. We would not have objected to it. It gives us both good talking points, I suppose, but I think the point of this whole discussion is we want to get beyond talking points.

I say to my friend, and everybody in this House knows that Roy Blunt and Steny Hoyer are good friends who

spend time together and respect one another, like one another. It is very difficult, I know, having been in your position for 4 years, not to take the opportunity to express grievances about what you believe is not being done that is fair to particularly the minority side. I understand that.

I simply want to say that we intend, as we have said, and one of the reasons we are not meeting Friday is because we have told committees we want them to do the regular order, have hearings, have votes in committee, bring bills to the Rules Committee, allow amendments, and as a result, they have said that is going to take us a little more time. So we do not have work to do. And we are not going to hold Members here, as Roy Blunt and I have discussed, if we don't have work to do. But we are going to try to get to substance.

I will say, for instance, on today's bill, we were very pleased that 57 Members on your side of the aisle voted with us on this. It was not a bipartisan two or three or four or five or six Members. A quarter of your caucus, indeed over a quarter of your caucus, voted for this bill. It was a bill that we needed to get through on substance. We think that speaks well for the substance, and that is what we are really talking about. We want to get to substance in a fair way. And we want to work with you, Mr. DREIER.

Certainly, I want to work with my good friend, the Republican whip, who is, I think, very sincere in his desire to make sure that we have legislation move through this body in a way that all the participants can feel they got a fair shot, whether they win or lose.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response.

I would say that while we don't want to debate the bill again that we voted on today, all of the Republicans voted for the motion that would have improved the bill. Certainly the option of the February 15 deadline has impact. I don't even want to argue the point that some of our Members then voted for final passage, but all of our Members would have liked to have had a more wide-ranging debate on the points that were raised in the motion to recommit that all of our Members voted for.

We also noted in the bill we just passed that rather than allocating funds to Members' committees and other offices of the House, this bill, essentially a bill that contained the funding for half of the discretionary spending, provided a lump sum in excess of \$1 billion. I think the exact quote that I will refer to for the leader was "to be allocated in accordance with the allocation plans submitted by the chief administrative officer and approved by the Committee on Appropriations."

A pretty wide-ranging ability to now set specific allocations and for the Appropriations Committee to approve those.

I am wondering specifically, does the majority intend to use these funds to create a new committee that is not currently in existence or currently authorized?

I will yield to my friend for a response.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly, those dollars which are allocated in contemplation of the administrative officer having an ability after a change, obviously, in management, if you will, to some degree, to have some flexibility, and as they plan, we will have a better idea of how they are going to spend that money, which will obviously have to be approved in the funding resolution out of House Administration, brought to this floor and voted upon by the Members. But certainly, parts of that fund would be available if the House decided to create a committee. You refer to the Select Committee on, I am sure, Energy.

Mr. BLUNT. I am. Or other select committees but that one, specifically.

Mr. HOYER. Or other select committees, if the House chose to do that through whatever mechanism it chose to do that. Yes. The answer to your question is a portion of that money would be available for that objective.

Mr. BLUNT. And if I understand what my good friend said, that money would be available, but would be authorized specifically by the funding resolution that would come from the House Administration?

Mr. HOYER. Of course, any committee, select committee or otherwise, unless there was a separate bill appropriating money towards that committee, we would expect that to be in the funding resolution for committees out of House Administration.

Mr. BLUNT. Again, reclaiming my time, just to be sure I am right on this, the funding resolution would come before the entire body before the appropriating committee would decide to do their allocation out of this one billion-plus dollars?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I don't know that that refers to all the money. That probably would not be accurate. And if I go further than I have already gone, I may be incorrect, and I don't want to misinform either you or the body because I have not talked to either House Administration or to Mr. OBEY about the specific allocation of these funds. Obviously, if the CR passes, they are appropriated to this fund for the CAO under the language that you read subject to the Appropriations Committee's approval.

□ 1615

However, in terms of the select committee or committee, my expectation would be that that specific item, not necessarily other items, would be subject to the funding resolution out of House Administration and come to this body.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time I have here, does the gentleman have a sense on the specific Select Committee on Global Warming and the Environment, or whatever it might be called, when that issue may come to the floor as a question?

Mr. HOYER. Well, if it is included in the House Administration funding resolution, and I am not saying that it will be, it may be in some other vehicle. But, if it did, that usually comes middle of March, late March, so that the committees can have a sense of what their funding capabilities are.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for that information. I am sure that all of our Members, as they hear the news about the ability to work in their districts on Friday, will be hoping to be on a plane Thursday night or Friday morning. I am not sure that I listened carefully to your sense of what would be the end of the day on Thursday since we would not be here on Friday. I am sure you said that, but if you would repeat.

Mr. HOYER. I don't think I said a time on Thursday. As you know as well, perhaps better than I do over the last years, particularly as you were the leader, you cannot always predict the time frame. But I would hope on Thursday we would get out at a reasonable hour to facilitate Members returning home.

Mr. BLUNT. Would you expect that the Thursday schedule would meet the standard that we have been trying to set on the Friday schedule, if we can at all?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. That is all I need to know.

Mr. HOYER. Let me retract that because I don't want to make a rule on that.

Mr. BLUNT. I understand.

Mr. HOYER. I want to have Members be very clear. If we are able to do our work within the time frame of Thursday, it may well be a late Thursday. When I say late, 5, 6, 7 o'clock Thursday, as opposed to 1 or 2 o'clock. So I maybe answered too quickly on the Friday schedule. Because on Friday we very definitely will be trying to get out, as I have said, no later than 2 o'clock and as close to 1 as we can. That gives us 4 hours. As you know, we have agreed that we will go in at 9. So that gives us 4 hours of legislative time to work on Fridays.

Committees, as I might tell my friend, you might be interested, the Government Operations Committee will be having hearings on Friday of next week, notwithstanding the fact that we are not here. So not only are they working at home, but there also will be people working here in Washington, notwithstanding the fact that we are not on the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, as it might make that answer easier for the future, I did not mean in any way to set a standard for future weeks. But I was thinking in

terms of this week, looking at 2 days of suspensions, 1 day of a bill that we have had on suspension before, even though it would have a rule, that I would think it would not be an unreasonable goal for us to set to get our, particularly our west coast Members, on the way home on late Thursday afternoon, rather than having to wait until Friday morning.

But I would also assume, having done both of the jobs you have held in the last few months, that there will be times when we will not necessarily need to be here on Friday, but to meet that goal we may have to work late enough on Thursday that many Members would not be on Thursday flights. I clearly understand that.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to prolong this, but I do want to say that the gentleman is correct in terms of, that is why I answered glibly and quickly. So I think the gentleman may be correct. I don't want to pledge that, but he may be correct because of the factors that he has pointed out.

I would say, in closing, that I know there has been some, joviality is a kind word, about what Mr. DREIER mentioned in the schedule getting out at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

But I will say with all due respect to my friend, notwithstanding that joviality, we believe that the last 3 weeks in terms of what this House has done in terms of its ethical standards, in terms of dealing with the safety of Americans in the 9/11 bill, in terms of dealing with the minimum wage, energy, dealing with college costs, dealing with prescription drugs and dealing with stem cell research, dealing with passing a CR that has funding for work that sat on the tarmac, if you will, and never got off the ground to the President for approximately 14 months or 13 months. We believe that we have provided a schedule in which we have done very substantial work. We hope the American people are pleased with that, and we continue to try to do that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

I know many of my colleagues on the floor assume that yielding that time gave you a good chance to talk about the last few weeks, and there are things to talk about. But I am sure you are getting plenty of discussion from all of the Members of the House, including the Members of the majority, about the schedule. I think that the determination for next week, which I believe would have been the first 5-day week we have had scheduled to work all 5 days, I think the determination of next week shows the leader's willingness to look at the facts of the week, rather than to be pinned down to a standard that doesn't necessarily let the Members do all of the work they need to do in the various places they need to do it. I am glad to see that change.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

NO PLAN FROM DEMOCRATS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their plan for winning the war on terror and for the current situation in Iraq. The only things that we have heard from Democrats has been criticism.

I also want to point out an article in today's Wall Street Journal and insert the entire article in the RECORD. The article is entitled, "Progress in Baghdad"; and it says, Capitol Hill has probably been too busy running for political cover to notice, but the last few days in Iraq have actually featured good news, as the government seems to be making some progress on key political and security issues.

And it ends with, the Bush administration has itself made many mistakes trying to micromanage Iraq's political development, but it now seems to understand that it is fated to deal with the Shiite-led government it has. Congressmen who are sincere in wanting to take the Iraq issue off the table in 2008 could help by showing a similar combination of resolve and humility.

I think we need the resolve and humility to say that we are there for victory and that failure is not an option.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

PROGRESS IN BAGHDAD

Capitol Hill has probably been too busy running for political cover to notice. But the last few days in Iraq have actually featured good news, as the government seems to be making some progress on key political and security issues.

One step forward is that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has won parliamentary backing for his Baghdad security plan. This means the elected representatives of Iraq's Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds remain capable of compromise and are willing to give the new strategy a chance to work.

There's also evidence that the Baghdad plan is having an effect. Yes, al Qaeda bombs targeted the Shiite Ashoura holiday as expected. But there are also widespread reports of Sunni jihadists fleeing the capital in anticipation of a crackdown. Prime Minister Maliki has already started moving against Shiite militias, which might explain an apparent drop in sectarian violence. No one should get overconfident, but clearly the bad guys are taking the joint U.S.-Iraqi effort to pacify the capital seriously. Meanwhile, the weekend saw an encouraging performance by the Iraqi security forces who took control of the Najaf area only about a month ago. Acting on their own intelligence, Iraqi police

and a battalion from the Eighth Army Division confronted a radical Shiite sect calling themselves the Soldiers of Heaven who had reportedly planned to assassinate mainstream Shiite clerics, including the moderate Grand Ayatollah Ali Sistani.

Some observers are trying to spin this battle as a defeat for the government, because the first Iraqi units on the scene had to call for reinforcements and for American air power. But the fact that Iraqi forces were able to pre-empt the attack on Najaf before it began, and that everyone involved was able to coordinate the operation and soundly defeat the enemy makes it sound like a success to us. Hundreds of the insurgents were killed, compared to a handful of Iraqi and U.S. troops. This may well be a model for how U.S. troops might play a supporting role down the road—assuming Washington gives them a chance to get Baghdad under control first.

For the moment at least, Iraq seems to be inching in the right direction. After a week of Western lamentations about the gracelessness of the Saddam hanging, it became clear that the primary effect of the execution was to enhance Prime Minister Maliki's stature in Iraq. Mr. Maliki, in turn, is using that political capital. The last thing he needs is to have his efforts undermined by votes of no-confidence in Washington—or meddling by Congressmen with “benchmarks” who pretend to know better than he does how to deal with the most difficult issues, such as how best to marginalize Moqtada al-Sadr.

The Bush Administration has itself made many mistakes trying to micromanage Iraq's political development, but it now seems to understand that it is fated to deal with the Shiite-led government it has. Congressmen who are sincere in wanting to take the Iraq issue off the table in 2008 could help by showing a similar combination of resolve and humility.

Let's unite.

IN SUPPORT OF THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION'S PASSAGE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to reflect on the last couple of hours of debate, and I call it fixing of the fiscal calamity that occurred over the last year when this body and the majority of my friends on the other side of the aisle failed to complete our funding responsibilities.

Today, we passed a vigorous CR, and I think it should not be interpreted as a negative, but we should look at the positives that we will be able to provide, if you will, the continuing of funding and get immediately into, one, the emergency supplemental but also the appropriations process. \$3.6 billion now goes extra to our veterans, many of them returning from Iraq for their health care.

The change in the section 8 for many that are not being housed because of a faulty formula, we now can provide housing for many in our community. And, yes, an enhanced funding for scientific research. The ability for our agencies to reprogram their dollars. Many of us will be working, for instance in my district, I will be working

to ensure the funding of the Texas Southern University Laboratory School through the Department of Housing; and, yes, we will be working to get NASA funding by redeploying or to redistribute those funds.

This is a good CR. The agencies can work with it. Make sure the agencies work right on behalf of the American people.

CONGRATULATING ROSWELL HIGH SCHOOL ON THEIR CHAMPIONSHIP SEASON

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I proudly rise to honor and congratulate some spectacular student athletes from Georgia's Sixth District. This past month one of our hometown high schools brought home the State football championship.

After an inspired season that united our community, Roswell High School awed all of Georgia with their first State football title in 36 years; and because of the passion and commitment and intensity shown by the players, coaches, classmates and the community alike, this season will forever be marked in history.

The Roswell Hornets won the 5A State championship in what was an extraordinary example of both skill and athleticism. These talented young men showed what is possible with hard work and unyielding determination.

These student athletes will always cherish the memory of this season. The players, their families and their classmates who cheered them on will always look back to the 2006 season as a source of pride, accomplishment and satisfaction. Roswell High School learned more than how to win a championship this last year. They learned what happens when everyone comes together in pursuit of a dream.

I know that the House of Representatives joins me in congratulating Roswell High School from Roswell, Georgia.

REAUTHORIZE THE SAFE AND SECURE COUNTY AND RURAL SCHOOLS ACT

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, today Congress passed a continuing resolution making up for some of the problems created by the Republican majority not getting their work done, but they did not get another crucial piece of work done, the reauthorization of the Safe and Secure County and Rural Schools Act. If that is not reauthorized, if that is not funded in short order, over 4,400 rural schools in 40 States will lose funding, 780 rural counties will lose funding for roads, county officials will be forced to lay off critical public safety, rescue, law enforce-

ment and other employees. In my State alone, there will be up to 1,000 people losing their jobs beginning quite soon.

Congress must act and soon. We will soon request that the leadership put in the emergency supplemental, money to fund for 1 year the Safe and Secure County Rural Schools Act to give the authorizing committees time to put in place a full 7-year reauthorization suitably offset with other funds.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1630

HRANT DINK'S FINAL ARTICLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, about a week and a half ago, a courageous journalist by the name of Hrant Dink was murdered outside of his newspaper office in Istanbul. I would like to read today some of the comments that he made in his last newspaper article Agos on January 19, the day that he was shot dead.

He wrote, “At first, when an investigation was launched against me for insulting Turkishness, I did not feel troubled. This was not the first time . . .

“I had complete trust in what I'd written and what had been my intentions.

“Once the prosecutor had the chance to evaluate the text of my editorial as a whole, not that single sentence, which made no sense by itself, he would understand that I had no intention of insulting Turkishness and this comedy would come to an end. I was sure of myself. But, surprise! A lawsuit was filed.

“In covering every hearing, the newspapers, editorials and television programs all referred to how I had said that the blood of the Turk is poisonous.

"Each time they were adding to my fame as the enemy of the Turk.

"In the corridors of the courthouse, the fascists physically attacked me with racist curses.

"They bombarded me with insults. Hundreds of threats hailed down for months by phone, e-mail and post, increasing all the time.

"I persevered through all of this with patience, awaiting the decision that would acquit me.

"Then the truth would prevail and all those people would be ashamed of what they had done.

"My only weapon was my sincerity. But when the decision came out, my hopes were crushed. From then on, I was in the most distressed situation a person can possibly be in.

"The judge had made a decision in the name of the Turkish nation and it had legally registered that I had denigrated Turkishness. I could have coped with anything but this.

"In my understanding, the denigration of a person on the basis of any difference, ethnic or religious, is racism, and there was no way this could ever be forgiven . . .

"Those who tried to single me out and weaken me have succeeded. With the false information they oozed into society, they created a significant segment of the population who saw Hrant Dink as someone who insults Turkishness.

"The memory of my computer is filled with angry, threatening lines sent by citizens from this sector.

"How real are these threats? To be honest, it is impossible for me to know for sure.

"What is truly threatening and unbearable for me is the psychological torture I placed myself in. The question that really gets to me is: What are these people thinking about me?

"Unfortunately, I am now better known than before and I feel people looking at me, thinking: Oh, look, isn't he that Armenian guy?

"I am just like a pigeon, equally obsessed by what goes on on my left and right, front and back. My head is just as mobile and fast.

"What did foreign Minister Gul say? Or Justice Minister Cicek? There is no need to exaggerate about Article 301 on insulting Turkishness. Has anyone been actually put in prison?

"As if going to prison was the only price to pay. This is the price. This is the price.

"Do you ministers know the price of making someone as scared as a pigeon?

"What my family and I have been through has not been easy. I have considered leaving this country at times . . .

"But leaving a boiling hell to run to a heaven is not for me. I wanted to turn this hell into heaven.

"We stayed in Turkey because that was what we wanted, out of respect for the thousands of people here who supported me in my fight for democracy. . . .

"I am now applying to the European Court of Human Rights. I don't know how long the case will take, but I do know that I will continue living here in Turkey until the case is finalized.

"And if the Court rules in my favor, I will be very happy and will never have to leave my country.

"2007 will probably be an even harder year for me. The Court cases will continue. New ones will be initiated and God knows what kind of additional injustices I will have to face.

"I may see myself as frightened as a pigeon, but I know that in this country people do not touch pigeons.

"Pigeons can live in cities, even in crowds. A little scared perhaps, but free."

Well, Mr. Dink, unfortunately, found otherwise when he was gunned down outside of his office by young men no doubt inflamed by the passions that the government did so little to quell. Hrant Dink, who had the courage to talk about some of the darkest periods of Ottoman history, of the genocide of the Armenian people, the first genocide of last century that claimed a million and a half lives, paid for that courage with his life.

Well, we will have the courage here soon to take up a resolution on the Armenian genocide. All we have to do is vote. That is very little compared to what Hrant Dink did and the price that he paid.

I had a chance to meet him in Istanbul a couple of years ago. He was optimistic about the future. He was optimistic about Turkey's future, about its willingness to examine its past. Regrettably, that optimism was misplaced.

Today we remember a courageous journalist, Hrant Dink. And his legacy lives on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING ALAN M. HANTMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased tonight to come to the floor for a special order presentation. Let me start out by reading some names. Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, Charles Bulfinch, Thomas U. Walter, Edward Clark, Elliott Woods, David Lynn, J. George Stewart, George M. White, and Alan M. Hantman.

My colleagues, I read these names. They are the names of the 10 architects of the United States Capitol.

This week will mark the last days in service to the United States Congress, and this historic structure, of the Ar-

chitect of the United States Capitol, Alan M. Hantman. And I am pleased to rise this evening to recognize his service.

Of course, we have had many presidents, we have had many Speakers of the House. We have only had 10 architects who have been in charge of this incredible structure that we call our United States Capitol.

Alan Hantman will leave his service, leaving a legacy untold by almost any of his predecessors. And it has been my honor and pleasure to work with him on a project that will dramatically change the nature of the United States Capitol, that is, the United States Capitol Visitors Center.

Let me reminisce for just a minute, as I thank him for his 10 years of dedicated and sometimes difficult and trying service to Congress. But let me reminisce, if I may, about Alan Hantman coming to serve as our United States Capitol architect.

I have been involved in the Capitol Visitors Center for some 14 years, since I came to Congress, committed that the people who visit this institution should have the opportunity to have an enjoyable, informative and memorable visit to the United States Capitol. Instead, in the past, they have stood in the rain, snow, sleet, cold, ice, without even common comforts or courtesy in front of our most historic structure, and sometimes denied access to the structure or again common conveniences.

I was a little bit afraid because I know the way this place runs, when they were selecting an architect, some 10 years ago, that they might find someone in this process that would deep six the project, so I spent a particular amount of time as author of two authorization measures for the project, talking to Alan Hantman, and I was convinced he was the right person at the right time in the history of the United States Capitol.

He undertook that expansion of the United States Capitol Building, the largest in history. It will increase the volume, the sheer volume of the Capitol by some 70 percent. And he has done an incredible job.

At the same time, he has had to make this Capitol run. I often joked when I first came here that the U.S. Capitol was run like a southern plantation with bad management.

Alan Hantman changed that. He brought professionalism to his position and to service and to, again, to the most monumental project, not on behalf of those who serve here. The Capitol Visitor Center, in fact, is the first structure and expansion to the Capitol in the history of the Capitol for the public, for those who own the place and to make, again, their visit an enjoyable, informative and educational experience.

Alan brought with him great experience from the private sector with more than 10 years heading up the Rockefeller Center Management Corporation

in New York City, overseeing that great project, and then coming here.

Now, I know he has had 535 bosses, a smaller group of Capitol preservation on which I serve, and then the leaders of the House and Senate and some of the appropriators and other authorizers. I call him working for 19 prima donnas. But he has completed the structure, planning, and under the most difficult circumstances you can imagine.

When people see the Visitor Center, the name of Alan Hantman will live forever in the history of the United States Congress and our country.

COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss some important issues that confront the 110th Congress regarding the structure and missions of the United States Coast Guard and the broader field of maritime transportation.

I am deeply honored to have been selected by Chairman JAMES OBERSTAR and by my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to chair the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee and to move on an ambitious agenda that will address these critical issues.

I look forward to implementing the three policy objectives that Chairman OBERSTAR has laid out for the Transportation Committee, which include ensuring the safety and security of our transportation infrastructure; supporting expanded investment in transportation infrastructure to relieve congestion and enhance mobility; and ensuring environmental stewardship, including combating global warming.

In the area of safety and security, the subcommittee will diligently oversee the implementation of the Coast Guard's \$8.3 billion fiscal year 2007 budget, including the more than \$1.1 billion appropriated to fund the rehabilitation and modernization of the Coast Guard's fleet through the Deepwater procurement program.

The United States Coast Guard is a critical part of our homeland security system, and is the lead agency responsible for ensuring the security of all ports in our Nation, including the more than 150 ports that handle the bulk of our Nation's foreign and commercial commerce.

The Coast Guard is also a vital part of our emergency response system, as demonstrated when it was the only Federal agency that could come to the rescue of thousands of Hurricane Katrina victims left stranded in the Gulf.

Our subcommittee will closely examine whether the Coast Guard has adequate resources to enable it to implement its significant new Homeland Se-

curity responsibilities while also fulfilling its other critical missions, including drug interdiction, search and rescue, and maritime safety oversight.

We began that effort just yesterday with an oversight hearing on the Coast Guard's \$24 billion, 25-year Deepwater procurement, through which the Coast Guard is acquiring the ships, planes and helicopters that the service will utilize for decades to come to ensure the safety and security of the American people, United States ports, and our maritime industry.

Importantly, our subcommittee will also balance oversight of the Coast Guard with our responsibility to strengthen maritime transportation.

The United States Maritime Administration estimates that the total volume of trade handled by U.S. ports will double in the next 15 years, Mr. Speaker. To prepare our Nation to handle such cargo growth, we will examine how U.S. ports can more fully be integrated into a multi-modal transportation network.

We will also work to foster a pragmatic dialogue between the members of the commercial maritime community and the United States Coast Guard to ensure that each group understands what the other needs to succeed in what should be their complementary pursuits.

□ 1645

Security of the United States ports and cargo transported through them will be a major priority of the subcommittee. The House of Representatives has already passed H.R. 1, which not only implemented the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission but exceeded these recommendations by phasing in requirements that will lead to the scanning of all cargo bound for United States ports.

The Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation will work closely with the Committee on Homeland Security, led ably by Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, to examine the gaps that remain in port security and to fill these gaps in ways that protect our Nation from emerging threats while not unduly slowing commerce to our ports.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 106

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING UC SANTA BARBARA MEN'S SOCCER TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support House Resolution 70, a resolution that this House passed earlier this week congratulating the University of California Santa Barbara men's soccer team for winning the NCAA Division I National Championship. I use these minutes to give my congratulations to the team and to the community.

Along with my colleague, Elton Gallegly, I am thrilled have this opportunity to congratulate every player, coach, alumnus, faculty member, and supporter of UC Santa Barbara.

On December 3, 2006, the UC Gauchos captured the National Championship by scoring two goals against the University of California. This is UCSB's second national title in school history.

While all the Gauchos played their hearts out, I would like to acknowledge two standout performances. Sophomore Nick Perera scored a goal and assisted on Eric Avila's game winner on his way to earning All-College Cup Most Outstanding Offensive Player of the Tournament honors. Junior Andy Iro, despite playing through an injury, helped keep UCLA at bay and was named All-College Cup Most Outstanding Defensive Player.

While the beginning of the Gauchos season was plagued by inconsistent play, the Gauchos fought to recover, winning 10 of their last 11 games, including six straight in the tournament. Coach Tim Vom Steeg, a UCSB alum, and his staff, Greg Wilson, Neil Jones, and Eric Foss, deserve tremendous praise not only for their impressive leadership in the 2006 season but also for leading the dominating Gauchos to their second NCAA National Championship in 3 years. Coach Vom Steeg's

colleagues were so impressed with his coaching abilities that they named him the National Soccer Coaches Association of America National Coach of the Year, the most prestigious award that a Division I soccer coach can receive, and this for the second time.

Mr. Speaker, while the men's soccer team is a great example of the excellence the university produces, there is much more to celebrate. As many of you know, my husband, Walter, was a professor of religious studies for more than 30 years at this campus at UCSB before he became a Member of Congress. Through his experience as a professor and my own as a graduate, I have watched this university rightfully gain national attention.

The University currently has five Nobel Laureates on faculty and was recently ranked in the top 15 best public schools in the Nation by U.S. News and World Report; and with a breathtakingly beautiful campus, it is no wonder that the men's soccer team and the University can attract such notable talent from all over the world.

If any of my colleagues ever find themselves on California's central coast, I encourage you to stop by this beautiful campus and see for yourself all that it has to offer. Of course, don't forget to catch a soccer game at Harder Stadium. Go Gauchos.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. McCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. McCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HANLEY DENNING, "ANGEL DEL BASUERO"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Hanley Graham Denning was only 36 when a terrible traffic accident in Guatemala took her away from us on January 18. She was revered in Guatemala where she was known as "El Angel del Basuero," the Angel of the Dump.

Hanley was a native of Yarmouth, Maine, and a Bowdoin College graduate, with a master's degree in early childhood education from Wheelock College.

After college, she helped children affected by AIDS in Roxbury, Massachusetts, and then taught impoverished children at a Head Start program in North Carolina.

Because so many children were from migrant families and spoke little or no English, Hanley decided to go to Guatemala to learn to speak their language. While in Guatemala City in 1999, the Portland Press Herald reported, a friend suggested she visit the garbage dump. There, Denning began the work that would come to define her life.

On that trip to the dump, the largest in Central America, Hanley was shocked to see a tiny hand reaching out from a cardboard box. "At first she thought it was a doll, then she realized it was a baby," her friend Rachel Meyn told the Press Herald. "The image kept playing over and over in her head," Meyn added, "and from then on she decided she had to do something." What Hanley Denning did was to sell her car and her computer, convert an old chapel near the dump into a drop-in center for the children, and give 40 Guatemalan boys and girls a refuge from the filth and stench of the dump.

Hanley soon learned that the health hazards at the dump were only a small part of the danger facing these children. Most came from single-parent households, where mothers scavenged the dump, often helped by the children, to find scrap to sell in order to buy food. Drug abuse, crime, child abuse, and predation were rampant. Hanley decided to create an environment where the children could escape harm and find the kind of encouragement that she as a former Head Start teacher knew would give them a better chance to grow into healthy successful adults. She called it "Camino Seguro," Safe Passage. The mothers and the children of Guatemala call Hanley Denning "Angel del Basuero," Angel of the Dump.

Eight years later, Hanley's modest effort has grown into a program that helps more than 500 needy children at three sites. It has an annual budget of \$1.6 million and 100 Guatemalan staff members, including teachers, social workers, cooks, and other support staff. There is a three-story educational reinforcement center, with 13 classrooms, a fully stocked library, a computer lab with 13 computers, a kitchen for preparing 550 lunches daily, a medical clinic serving all children and their family members, and a garden. Teens can receive vocational training, mothers and grandmothers can attend adult literacy and parenting classes.

In addition to their daily hot lunches, each child who attends regularly receives a monthly food bag for their family. Nearly 600 children fated to scavenge the dump like their parents are now in school. "I used to look into the children's eyes and see the adults they would become," Hanley once told the reporter. "Now they have a little hope. I see a bit more spark."

But the success of Safe Passage is only part of Hanley Denning's legacy. Her angelic touch reached beyond the Guatemalan slums and into the lives of hundreds of volunteers, many of them

teenagers, who worked for Safe Passage over the years. There are 50 volunteers working at Safe Passage in any given month, including 20 long-term volunteers who make a 1-year or 2-year commitment to the program.

As Jason Moyer-Lee told the Portland Press Herald's Bill Nemitz, "I couldn't believe that someone from my town who went to my high school could actually make something like that happen. When Hanley sat down and talked to you, she made you feel like, without your help, Safe Passage couldn't happen," he said. "It didn't matter how much you gave or how little, she made you feel like you were the number one contributor."

"I've never loved more than when I was combing lice out of children's hair," added Aly Spaltro, a Brunswick High School senior who volunteered at Safe Passage in the past and plans to return before she returns to college.

Although his sister Hanley died young, her brother Jordan said at her memorial that she had lived a much fuller life than most people, and she inspired everyone who loved her to "give every ounce of ourselves to what we truly believe in."

Mr. Speaker, I refer to safepassage.org for on Hanley Denning's life.

Catherine Lopez Reyes, a five year old at Safe Passage, best summed up the feelings of all whose lives Hanley Denning changed for the better: "Hanley, te quiero mucho, We love you very much, Hanley."

To learn more about Hanley Denning and her Safe Passage program, visit the website safepassage.org.

See safepassage.org for the extraordinary story of the life of a remarkable woman.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT JACOB N. FRITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Iraq weighs heavily on us all, especially when we receive casualty announcements and face the stark reality of precious lives lost far from the comfort of home and family.

Today, I would like to pay tribute to First Lieutenant Jacob N. Fritz of Verdon, Nebraska, who lost his life in a brutal ambush on January 23.

A graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, Lieutenant Fritz served valiantly in the Army's 25th Infantry Division when he came under attack near Karbala, Iraq. While details are still pending, we know that a group of men wearing U.S. military uniforms infiltrated a government compound and opened fire on Lieutenant Fritz, who was standing outside his vehicle at the time of the incident.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to Lyle and Noala Fritz, Jacob's parents, for taking so much time to speak with me

about Jacob recently. As Noala said to me, "God got a good one."

Continuing a proud family tradition, Lieutenant Fritz's brother Daniel is currently at West Point and is scheduled to graduate in the year 2008. I want to reassure Daniel and the entire Fritz family that we are all united in our support and concern for the outstanding men and women who willingly risk their lives in Iraq under arduous circumstances that would tax the best of us.

Mr. Speaker, as we take this moment to grieve, we also want to honor the Fritz family for their dedicated service to the United States. I pray that God's peace will console and strengthen them during this difficult time and in the days ahead.

THE SAFE AND ORDERLY WITHDRAWAL FROM IRAQ ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is no issue more important to the American people and to the Members of this Congress than the war in Iraq. Over 3,000 American military personnel have been killed in this war. Over 22,000 have been wounded in combat-related action. Some have been injured for life. Several thousand more of our troops have sustained serious injuries or suffered sickness while serving in Iraq; and tens of thousands of Iraqi men, women, and children dead.

So far, it has cost the United States \$387 billion, and next week we will receive another supplemental request from the President in the range of \$100 billion to \$130 billion more.

In blood, in treasure, the costs of the war in Iraq have been high. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must change the dynamic in Iraq. We must end our occupation, engage the countries in the region to help the Iraqis negotiate an end to the sectarian violence tearing their country apart, and let the Iraqi people determine their own destiny.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, there is no military victory to be had in Iraq. So I am convinced that we must focus our efforts on the uniformed men and women we have put in harm's way and bring them safely home. This is why I am introducing today the Safe and Orderly Withdrawal from Iraq Act.

This is a very straightforward bill, Mr. Speaker. Within 30 days of enactment, the United States would initiate a safe, orderly, and responsible withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Iraq.

□ 1700

The withdrawal would take no more than 6 months and include the transfer to the Iraqi government of all bases and facilities that have been operated or occupied by U.S. military personnel. During the withdrawal period, funding is maintained to ensure that our forces

have the ability to complete or transfer their duties in an orderly manner, defend themselves as necessary, and be fully supported as they move out of Iraq. Once the withdrawal is completed, defense funding for the war would end.

Under this bill, financial support and equipment could continue to be provided to the Iraqi security forces or to a multilateral force the Iraqi government might request for help in continuing the training of their forces and in providing security during the period of withdrawal and afterwards.

Nothing in this bill affects U.S. funding for economic and social reconstruction projects. The bill also allows the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to complete reconstruction projects currently under way should the Iraqi government make such a request.

Finally, the bill asserts the authority of the President to arrange asylum for those Iraqi citizens who might be physically endangered by the withdrawal of our military presence. As we all know, many Iraqi civilians have bravely served our Armed Forces as translators, drivers, administrative staff and in other capacities. Should they be threatened with violence or retaliation because of their association with our forces, we should extend to them the protection they require and that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not walk away from Iraq. It maintains financial equipment and material support for the Iraqi military and security forces. It continues economic, social and reconstruction assistance for Iraq, and its impact would trigger greater diplomatic engagement in the region which is missing at the present moment.

Mr. Speaker, there are no easy answers for the many questions facing Iraq's future. There is no perfect legislative answer for the situation in Iraq. But I do know that our troops do not belong in the crossfire of a violent Iraqi sectarian war. The American people understand this. They are far ahead of the politicians in Washington. They want us to do what is right. They want us to bring our troops home, and they want that to happen in a safe, orderly and responsible manner.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this war in Iraq is a moral blunder. I believe that the war in Iraq represents one of the biggest political, diplomatic and military mistakes in our history. It is time for us to end this war. I urge my colleagues to support the Safe and Orderly Withdrawal from Iraq Act.

HONORING COLONEL BRIAN D. ALLGOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Colonel Brian D. Allgood, who passed away on January 27, 2007, in Baghdad, Iraq, in sup-

port of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Colonel Allgood died of injuries sustained when his helicopter crashed. Brian's wife and son reside in Heidelberg, Germany, and his parents, Gerald and Cleo Allgood, reside in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Colonel Allgood graduated from West Point in 1982 and from the University of Oklahoma Medical Center in 1986. After completing his residency, Colonel Allgood continued his military career as a doctor in the Army. He was not only a doctor but was a first-class soldier who parachuted into Panama as a battalion surgeon in the 75th Ranger Regiment during Operation Just Cause in 1989. After rising through the ranks, Brian became a full colonel in 2002 and served in top medical commands in Korea and Germany before becoming the command surgeon of Multi-National Forces Iraq.

Colonel Allgood comes from a strong military family and followed in the footsteps of his father, who was a Army doctor and a Vietnam War veteran.

Colonel Allgood was a remarkable soldier, an exceptional doctor and a devoted husband and father who served in the Army to keep this Nation free and sacrificed his life for our safety and security.

I thank Colonel Brian D. Allgood for his service to our country, and I offer my deepest condolences to his family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SOLIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on January 23, 2007.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interests of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
110TH CONGRESS

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Applicability of House Rules.—(1) The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee and its subcommittees, and the rules of the Committee on Agriculture so far as applicable shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees. (See Appendix A for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

(2) As provided in clause 1(a)(2) of House Rule XI, each subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its rules so far as applicable. (See also Committee rules III, IV, V, VI, VII and X, *infra*.)

(b) Authority to Conduct Investigations.—The Committee and its subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, may conduct such investigations and studies as they may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of their responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and in accordance with clause 2(m) of House Rule XI.

(c) Authority to Print.—The Committee is authorized by the Rules of the House to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee and its subcommittees. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be paid from applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of House Rule X in accordance with clause 1(c) of House Rule XI. (See also paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of Committee rule VIII.)

(d) Vice Chairman.—The Member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee designated by the Chairman of the full Committee shall be the vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee in accordance with clause 2(d) of House Rule XI.

(e) Presiding Member.—If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee is not present at any Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing, the vice chairman shall preside. If the Chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at a Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing the ranking Member of the majority party who is present shall preside in accordance with clause 2(d), House Rule XI.

(f) Activities Report.—(1) The Committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the Committee under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House during the Congress ending on January 3 of such year. (See also Committee rule VIII h)(2).)

(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee during that Congress.

(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee pursuant

to clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken with respect thereto.

(g) Publication of Rules.—The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than thirty days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year as provided in clause 2(a) of House Rule XI.

(h) Joint Committee Reports of Investigation or Study.—A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by more than one committee may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

RULE II.—COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETINGS—
REGULAR, ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL

(a) Regular Meetings.—(1) Regular meetings of the Committee, in accordance with clause 2(b) of House Rule XI, shall be held on the first Wednesday of every month to transact its business unless such day is a holiday, or Congress is in recess or is adjourned, in which case the Chairman shall determine the regular meeting day of the Committee, if any, for that month. The Chairman shall provide each member of the Committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as practicable, a written agenda of such meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chairman or a majority of the Committee. If the Chairman believes that there will not be any bill, resolution or other matter considered before the full Committee and there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, the meeting may be cancelled or it may be deferred until such time as, in the judgment of the Chairman, there may be matters which require the Committee's consideration. This paragraph shall not apply to meetings of any subcommittee. (See paragraph (f) of Committee rule X for provisions that apply to meetings of subcommittees.)

(b) Additional Meetings.—The Chairman may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such additional meetings pursuant to a notice from the Chairman.

(c) Special Meetings.—If at least three members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman for such special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matters to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk of the Committee for such purpose) shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measures or matter to be considered at that special meeting in accordance with clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk) of the Committee shall

notify all members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered, and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

RULE III.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS;
BROADCASTING

(a) Open Meetings and Hearings.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of House Rule XI. (See Appendix A.)

(b) Broadcasting and Photography.—Whenever a Committee or subcommittee meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of House Rule XI (See Appendix A). When such radio coverage is conducted in the Committee or subcommittee, written notice to that effect shall be placed on the desk of each Member. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, shall not limit the number of television or still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(c) Closed Meetings—Attendees.—No person other than Members of the Committee or subcommittee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session that has been closed to the public as provided in clause 2(g)(1) of House Rule XI.

(d) Addressing the Committee.—A Committee member may address the Committee or a subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration (See Committee rule VII(e) relating to questioning a witness at a hearing). The time a member may address the Committee or subcommittee for any such purpose shall be limited to five minutes, except that this time limit may be waived by unanimous consent. A member shall also be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend his or her remarks beyond such subject.

(e) Meetings To Begin Promptly.—Subject to the presence of a quorum, each meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall begin promptly at the time so stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(f) Prohibition on Proxy Voting.—No vote by any Member of the Committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(g) Location of Persons at Meetings.—No person other than the Committee or subcommittee Members and Committee or subcommittee staff may be seated in the rostrum area during a meeting of the Committee or subcommittee unless by unanimous consent of Committee or subcommittee.

(h) Consideration of Amendments and Motions.—A Member, upon request, shall be recognized by the Chairman to address the Committee or subcommittee at a meeting for a period limited to five minutes on behalf of an amendment or motion offered by the Member or another Member, or upon any other matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend the time limit. Every amendment or motion made in Committee or subcommittee shall, upon the demand of any Member

present, be reduced to writing, and a copy thereof shall be made available to all Members present. Such amendment or motion shall not be pending before the Committee or subcommittee or voted on until the requirements of this paragraph have been met.

(i) Demanding Record Vote.—

(1) A record vote of the Committee or subcommittee on a question or action shall be ordered on a demand by one-fifth of the Members present.

(2) The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. If the Chairman postpones further proceedings:

(A) the Chairman may resume such postponed proceedings, after giving Members adequate notice, at a time chosen in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member; and

(B) notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition on which proceedings were postponed shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(j) Submission of Motions or Amendments in Advance of Business Meetings.—The Committee and subcommittee Chairman may request and Committee and subcommittee Members should, insofar as practicable, cooperate in providing copies of proposed amendments or motions to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or the subcommittee twenty-four hours before a Committee or subcommittee business meeting.

(k) Points of Order.—No point of order against the hearing or meeting procedures of the Committee or subcommittee shall be entertained unless it is made in a timely fashion.

(l) Limitation on Committee Sitzings.—The Committee or subcommittees may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

(m) Prohibition of Wireless Telephones.—Use of wireless phones during a committee or subcommittee hearing or meeting is prohibited.

RULE IV.—QUORUMS

(a) Working Quorum.—One-third of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, other than as noted in paragraphs (b) and (c).

(b) Majority Quorum.—A majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for:

(1) the reporting of a bill, resolution or other measure (See clause 2(h)(1) of House Rules XI, and Committee rule VIII);

(2) the closing of a meeting or hearing to the public pursuant to clauses 2(g) and 2(k)(5) of the Rule XI of the Rules of the House; and

(3) the authorizing of a subpoena as provided in clause 2(m)(3), of House Rule XI. (See also Committee rule VI.)

(c) Quorum for Taking Testimony.—Two members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE V.—RECORDS

(a) Maintenance of Records.—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee and subcommittee action which shall include—

(1) in the case of any meeting or hearing transcripts, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved, and

(2) written minutes shall include a record of all Committee and subcommittee action and a record of all votes on any question and a tally on all record votes.

The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and by telephone request. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(b) Access to and Correction of Records.—Any public witness, or person authorized by such witness, during Committee office hours in the Committee offices and within two weeks of the close of hearings, may obtain a transcript copy of that public witness's testimony and make such technical, grammatical and typographical corrections as authorized by the person making the remarks involved as will not alter the nature of testimony given. There shall be prompt return of such corrected copy of the transcript to the Committee. Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall receive copies of transcripts for their prompt review and correction and prompt return to the Committee. The Committee or subcommittee may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any Member or witness if it determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time in which to make such corrections and further delay would seriously impede the consideration of the legislative action that is subject of the hearing. The record of a hearing shall be closed ten calendar days after the last oral testimony, unless the Committee or subcommittee determines otherwise. Any person requesting to file a statement for the record of a hearing must so request before the hearing concludes and must file the statement before the record is closed unless the Committee or subcommittee determines otherwise. The Committee or subcommittee may reject any statement in light of its length or its tendency to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Property of the House.—All Committee and subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Members serving as Chairman and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto. The Majority Staff Director shall promptly notify the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of any request for access to such records.

(d) Availability of Archived Records.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House Rule VII. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee of the need for a Committee order pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such House Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available.

(e) Special Rules for Certain Records and Proceedings.—A stenographic record of a business meeting of the Committee or subcommittee may be kept and thereafter may be published if the Chairman of the Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is need for such a record. The proceedings of the Committee or subcommittee in a closed meeting, evidence or testimony in such meeting, shall not be divulged unless otherwise determined by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee.

(f) Electronic Availability of Committee Publications.—To the maximum extent fea-

sible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE VI.—POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) Authority to Sit and Act.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its function and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee and each of its subcommittees is authorized (subject to paragraph (b)(1) of this rule)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings, and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents, as it deems necessary. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Issuance of Subpoenas.—(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present, as provided in clause 2(m)(3)(A) of House Rule XI. Such authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any member designated by the Committee. As soon as practicable after a subpoena is issued under this rule, the Chairman shall notify all members of the Committee of such action.

(2) Notice of a meeting to consider a motion to authorize and issue a subpoena should be given to all Members of the Committee by 5 p.m. of the day preceding such meeting.

(3) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(4) A subpoena duces tecum may specify terms of return other than at a meeting or hearing of the committee or subcommittee authorizing the subpoena.

(c) Expenses of Subpoenaed Witnesses.—Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his or her testimony before the Committee or any subcommittee, may report to the offices of the Committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees to which he or she is entitled. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington D.C., the subpoenaed witness may contact the Majority Staff Director of the Committee, or his or her representative, before leaving the hearing room.

RULE VII.—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) Power to Hear.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rule X and XI, the Committee and its subcommittees are authorized to sit and hold hearings at any time or place within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned. (See paragraph (a) of Committee rule VI and paragraph (f) of Committee rule X for provisions relating to subcommittee hearings and meetings.)

(b) Announcement.—The Chairman of the Committee shall after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, make a public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. The Chairman of a subcommittee shall schedule a hearing only after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee, and the Chairmen

of the other subcommittees after such consultation with the Committee Chairman, and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of such hearing at least one week before the hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or the subcommittee, with concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall request the Majority Staff Director to make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record, and shall promptly enter the appropriate information into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(c) **Scheduling of Witnesses.**—Except as otherwise provided in this rule, the scheduling of witnesses and determination of the time allowed for the presentation of testimony at hearings shall be at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee determines otherwise.

(d) **Written Statement; Oral Testimony.**—(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee, shall insofar as practicable file with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee, at least two working days before day of his or her appearance, a written statement of proposed testimony. Witnesses shall provide sufficient copies of their statement for distribution to Committee or subcommittee Members, staff, and the news media. Insofar as practicable, the Committee or subcommittee staff shall distribute such written statements to all Members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as they are received as well as any official reports from departments and agencies on such subject matter. All witnesses may be limited in their oral presentations to brief summaries of their statements within the time allotted to them, at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, in light of the nature of the testimony and the length of time available.

(2) As noted in paragraph (a) of Committee rule VI, the Chairman of the Committee or one of its subcommittees, or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(3) To the greatest extent practicable, each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(e) **Questioning of Witnesses.**—Committee or subcommittee Members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee for that purpose. Each Member so recognized shall be limited to questioning a witness for five minutes until such time as each Member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness for five minutes; and thereafter the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee may limit the time of a further round of questioning after giving due consideration to the importance of the subject matter and the length of time available. All questions put to witnesses

shall be germane to the measure or matter under consideration. Unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee determines otherwise, no committee or subcommittee staff shall interrogate witnesses.

(f) **Extended Questioning for Designated Members.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (e), the Chairman and Ranking Minority member may designate an equal number of Members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 60 minutes.

(g) **Witnesses for the Minority.**—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee or subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon as provided in clause 2(j)(1) of House Rule XI.

(h) **Summary of Subject Matter.**—Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable, the Committee shall make available immediately to all members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall, to the extent practicable, make available to the members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter. (See Committee rule X(f).)

(i) **Open Hearings.**—Each hearing conducted by the Committee or subcommittee shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage, except as provided in clause 4 of House Rule XI (see also Committee rule III (b)). In any event, no Member of the House may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing unless the House by majority vote shall authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular bill or resolution or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by means of the above procedure.

(j) **Hearings and Reports.**—(1)(i) The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation. A copy of the Committee rules (and the applicable provisions of clause 2 of House Rule XI, regarding hearing procedures, an excerpt of which appears in Appendix A thereto) shall be made available to each witness upon request. Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; but only the full Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(ii) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (j) of this rule, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or

testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall afford a person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and the Committee or subcommittee shall receive and shall dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(iii) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee or subcommittee. In the discretion of the Committee or subcommittee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee or subcommittee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings. A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee or subcommittee. (See paragraph (c) of Committee rule V.)

(2) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day) in advance of their consideration.

RULE VIII.—THE REPORTING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) **Filing of Reports.**—The Chairman shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee and shall take or cause to be taken all necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or other measure to a vote. No bill, resolution, or measure shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of Committee is actually present. A Committee report on any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (not counting days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the Committee, for the reporting of that bill or resolution. The Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall notify the Chairman immediately when such a request is filed.

(b) **Content of Reports.**—Each Committee report on any bill or resolution approved by the Committee shall include as separately identified sections:

- (1) a statement of the intent or purpose of the bill or resolution;
- (2) a statement describing the need for such bill or resolution;
- (3) a statement of Committee and subcommittee consideration of the measure including a summary of amendments and motions offered and the actions taken thereon;
- (4) the results of the each record vote on any amendment in the Committee and subcommittee and on the motion to report the measure or matter, including the names of those Members and the total voting for and the names of those Members and the total voting against such amendment or motion (See clause 3(b) of House rule XIII);

(5) the oversight findings and recommendations of the Committee with respect to the subject matter of the bill or resolution as required pursuant to clause 3(c)(1) of House Rule XIII and clause 2(b)(1) of House Rule X;

(6) the detailed statement described in section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority (other than continuing appropriations), new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, except that the estimates with respect to new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a

comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) to the appropriate levels under current law;

(7) the estimate of costs and comparison of such estimates, if any, prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with such bill or resolution pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if submitted in timely fashion to the Committee;

(8) a statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding;

(9) a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution;

(10) an estimate by the committee of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and for its authorized duration or for each of the five fiscal years following the fiscal year of reporting, whichever period is less (see Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(2), (3) and (h)(2), (3)), together with—

(i) a comparison of these estimates with those made and submitted to the Committee by any Government agency when practicable, and (ii) a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) with appropriate levels under current law (The provisions of this clause do not apply if a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and included in the report);

(11) a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

(12) the changes in existing law (if any) shown in accordance with clause 3 of House Rule XIII;

(13) the determination required pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 92-463, if the legislation reported establishes or authorizes the establishment of an advisory committee; and

(14) the information on Federal and intergovernmental mandates required by section 423(c) and (d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as added by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-4).

(15) a statement regarding the applicability of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act, Public Law 104-1.

(c) **Supplemental, Minority, or Additional Views.**—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than two subsequent calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such date) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that Member, with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee. When time guaranteed by this paragraph has expired (or if sooner, when all separate views have been received), the Committee may arrange to file its report with the Clerk of the House not later than one hour after the expiration of such time. All such views (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(1) and House Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1)), as filed by one or more Members of the Committee, shall be included within and made a part of the report filed by the Com-

mittee with respect to that bill or resolution.

(d) **Printing of Reports.**—The report of the Committee on the measure or matter noted in paragraph (a) above shall be printed in a single volume, which shall:

(1) include all supplemental, minority or additional views that have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and

(2) bear on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under House Rule XII, clause 3(a)(1)) are included as part of the report.

(e) **Immediate Printing; Supplemental Reports.**—Nothing in this rule shall preclude (1) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by paragraph (c), or (2) the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report on any bill or resolution that may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that bill or resolution.

(f) **Availability of Printed Hearing Records.**—If hearings have been held on any reported bill or resolution, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have the record of such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such bill or resolution by the House. Each printed hearing of the Committee or any of its subcommittees shall include a record of the attendance of the Members.

(g) **Committee Prints.**—All Committee or subcommittee prints or other Committee or subcommittee documents, other than reports or prints of bills, that are prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Chairman of the Committee or the Committee prior to public distribution.

(h) **Post Adjournment Filing of Committee Reports.**—(1) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

(2) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chairman of the Committee may file at any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(i) The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE IX.—OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

(a) **Oversight Plan.**—Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Chairman shall convene the Committee in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress. Such plans shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Government Reform and to the Committee on House Administration. In developing such plans the Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

(1) consult with other committees of the House that have jurisdiction over the same

or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction, with the objective of ensuring that such laws, programs, or agencies are reviewed in the same Congress and that there is a maximum of coordination between such committees in the conduct of such reviews; and such plans shall include an explanation of what steps have been and will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

(2) review specific problems with federal rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary, or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals; and

(3) give priority consideration to including in its plans the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority; and

(4) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review at least once every ten years.

The Committee and its appropriate subcommittees shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdiction as provided in clause 2(d) of House Rule X. The Committee shall include in the report filed pursuant to clause 1(d) of House Rule XI a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee under clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

(b) **Annual Appropriations.**—The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) **Budget Act Compliance: Views and Estimates** (See Appendix B).—Not later than six weeks after the President submits his budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request, the Committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year (under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—see Appendix B) that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) **Budget Act Compliance: Recommended Changes.**—Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process, it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (See Appendix B).

(e) Conference Committees.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall, after consultation with the Ranking minority member, determine the number of conferees the Chairman deems most suitable and then recommend to the Speaker as conferees, in keeping with the number to be appointed by the Speaker as provided in House Rule I, clause 11, the names of those Members of the Committee of not less than a majority who generally supported the House position and who were primarily responsible for the legislation. The Chairman shall, to the fullest extent feasible, include those Members of the Committee who were the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House and such other Committee Members of the majority party as the Chairman may designate in consultation with the Members of the majority party. Such recommendations shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members on the Committee. In making recommendations of minority party Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE X.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Number and Composition.—There shall be such subcommittees as specified in paragraph (c) of this rule. Each of such subcommittees shall be composed of the number of members set forth in paragraph (c) of this rule, including ex officio members. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee serve as ex officio Members of the Subcommittees. (See paragraph (e) of this Rule.) The Chairman may create additional subcommittees of an ad hoc nature as the Chairman determines to be appropriate subject to any limitations provided for in the House Rules.

(b) Ratios.—On each subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included the ex officio members of the subcommittees and ratios below reflect that fact.

(c) Jurisdiction.—Each subcommittee shall have the following general jurisdiction and number of members:

Conservation, Credit, Energy, and Research (28 Members, 15 Majority and 13 Minority).—Soil, water, and resource conservation, small watershed program, energy and bio-based energy production, rural electrification, agricultural credit, and agricultural research, education and extension services.

Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry (13 Members, 7 Majority and 6 Minority).—Agency oversight, review and analysis, special investigations, food stamps, nutrition and consumer programs, forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

General Farm Commodities and Risk Management (20 Members, 11 Majority and 9 Minority).—Program and markets related to cotton, cottonseed, wheat, feed grains, soybeans, oilseeds, rice, dry beans, peas, lentils, the Commodity Credit Corporation, crop insurance, and commodity exchanges.

Horticulture and Organic Agriculture (13 Members, 7 Majority and 6 Minority).—Fruits and vegetables, honey and bees, marketing and promotion orders, plant pesticides, quarantine, adulteration of seeds, and insect pests, and organic agriculture.

Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry (20 Members, 11 Majority and 9 Minority).—Live-

stock, dairy, poultry, meat, seafood and seafood products, inspection, marketing, and promotion of such commodities, aquaculture, animal welfare, and grazing.

Specialty Crops, Rural Development and Foreign Agriculture (13 Members, 7 Majority and 6 Minority).—Peanuts, sugar, tobacco, marketing orders relating to such commodities, rural development, farm security and family farming matters, biotechnology, foreign agricultural assistance, and trade promotion programs, generally.

(d) Referral of Legislation.—

(1)(a) In General.—All bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to all subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks after being referred to the Committee. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may determine that the Committee will consider certain bills, resolutions, or other matters.

(b) Trade Matters.—Unless action is otherwise taken under subparagraph (3), bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee relating to foreign agriculture, foreign food or commodity assistance, and foreign trade and marketing issues will be considered by the Committee.

(2) The Chairman, by a majority vote of the Committee, may discharge a subcommittee from further consideration of any bill, resolution, or other matter referred to the subcommittee and have such bill, resolution or other matter considered by the Committee. The Committee having referred a bill, resolution, or other matter to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may discharge such subcommittee from further consideration thereof at any time by a vote of the majority members of the Committee for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(3) Unless the Committee, a quorum being present, decides otherwise by a majority vote, the Chairman may refer bills, resolutions, legislation or other matters not specifically within the jurisdiction of a subcommittee, or that is within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, jointly or exclusively as the Chairman deems appropriate, including concurrently to the subcommittees with jurisdiction, sequentially to the subcommittees with jurisdiction (subject to any time limits deemed appropriate), divided by subject matter among the subcommittees with jurisdiction, or to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the Chairman for the purpose of considering the matter and reporting to the Committee thereon, or make such other provisions deemed appropriate.

(e) Participation and Service of Committee Members on Subcommittees.—(1) The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall serve as ex officio members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittees. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member may not be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

(2) Any member of the Committee who is not a member of the subcommittee may have the privilege of sitting and nonparticipatory attendance at subcommittee hearings or meetings in accordance with clause 2(g)(2) of House Rule XI. Such member may not:

- (i) vote on any matter;
- (ii) be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum;
- (iii) participate in questioning a witness under the five minute rule, unless permitted to do so by the subcommittee Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member or a majority of the subcommittee, a quorum being present;
- (iv) raise points of order; or
- (v) offer amendments or motions.

(f) Subcommittee Hearings and Meetings.—

(1) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and make recommendations to the Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction after consultation by the subcommittee Chairmen with the Committee Chairman. (See Committee rule VII.)

(2) After consultation with the Committee Chairman, subcommittee Chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their subcommittees and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make any announcement relating thereto. (See Committee rule VII(b).) In setting the dates, the Committee Chairman and subcommittee Chairman shall consult with other subcommittee Chairmen and relevant Committee and Subcommittee Ranking Minority Members in an effort to avoid simultaneously scheduling Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings to the extent practicable.

(3) Notice of all subcommittee meetings shall be provided to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee by the Majority Staff Director.

(4) Subcommittees may hold meetings or hearings outside of the House if the Chairman of the Committee and other subcommittee Chairmen and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee is consulted in advance to ensure that there is no scheduling problem. However, the majority of the Committee may authorize such meeting or hearing.

(5) The provisions regarding notice and the agenda of Committee meetings under Committee rule II(a) and special or additional meetings under Committee rule II(b) shall apply to subcommittee meetings.

(6) If a vacancy occurs in a subcommittee chairmanship, the Chairman may set the dates for hearings and meetings of the subcommittee during the period of vacancy. The Chairman may also appoint an acting subcommittee Chairman until the vacancy is filled.

(g) Subcommittee Action.—(1) Any bill, resolution, recommendation, or other matter forwarded to the Committee by a subcommittee shall be promptly forwarded by the subcommittee Chairman or any subcommittee member authorized to do so by the subcommittee. (2) Upon receipt of such recommendation, the Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall promptly advise all members of the Committee of the subcommittee action.

(3) The Committee shall not consider any matters recommended by subcommittees until two calendar days have elapsed from the date of action, unless the Chairman or a majority of the Committee determines otherwise.

(h) Subcommittee Investigations.—No investigation shall be initiated by a subcommittee without the prior consultation with the Chairman of the Committee or a majority of the Committee.

RULE XI.—COMMITTEE BUDGET, STAFF, AND TRAVEL

(a) Committee Budget.—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority members of the Committee, and the minority members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget for each session of the Congress. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and subcommittees. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted to minority members for staff under their direction and supervision. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall take whatever action is necessary to have such budget duly authorized by the House.

(b) Committee Staff.—(1) The Chairman shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate. (See House Rule X, clause 9)

(2) The Ranking Minority member of the Committee shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee who may delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(3) From the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to any primary or additional expense resolution, the Chairman shall ensure that each subcommittee is adequately funded and staffed to discharge its responsibilities and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff (See House Rule X, clause 6(d)).

(c) Committee Travel.—(1) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee members and Committee staff regarding domestic and foreign travel (See House rule XI, clause 2(n) and House Rule X, clause 8 (reprinted in Appendix A)). Official travel for any member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Committee Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee and its subcommittees and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (i) The purpose of the official travel;
- (ii) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;
- (iii) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and
- (iv) The names of members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

(2) In the case of official travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to the Committee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated in clause (1).

(3) Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

(4) Local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Com-

mittee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories or possessions. No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of Members of the Committee or is employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose; and the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies;

(i) No Member or employee of the Committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law; and

(ii) Each Member or employee of the Committee shall make an itemized report to the Chairman within 60 days following the completion of travel showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose, and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies and appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports shall be filed by the Chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

RULE XII.—AMENDMENT OF RULES

These rules may be amended by a majority vote of the Committee. A proposed change in these rules shall not be considered by the Committee as provided in clause 2 of House Rule XI, unless written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each Committee member two legislative days in advance of the date on which the matter is to be considered. Any such change in the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after its approval.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Committee on Homeland Security adopted these rules by voice vote, a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on January 23, 2007.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
COMMITTEE RULES, ADOPTED JANUARY 23, 2007

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(A) Applicability of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.—The Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives (the "House") are the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security (the "Committee") and its subcommittees insofar as applicable.

(B) Applicability to Subcommittees.—Except where the terms "Full Committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically mentioned, the following rules shall apply to the Committee's subcommittees and their respective Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members to the same extent as they apply to the Full Committee and its Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

(C) Appointments by the Chairman.—The Chairman shall designate a Member of the Majority party to serve as Vice Chairman of the Full Committee. The Vice Chairman of the Full Committee shall preside at any

meeting or hearing of the Full Committee during the temporary absence of the Chairman. In the absence of both the Chairman and Vice Chairman, the Chairman's designee shall preside.

(D) Recommendation of Conferees.—Whenever the Speaker of the House is to appoint a conference committee on a matter within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker of the House conferees from the Full Committee. In making recommendations of Minority Members as conferees, the Chairman shall do so with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(E) Motions To Disagree.—The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(F) Committee Website.—The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee web site for the purposes of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee Members, other Members and the public at large. The Ranking Minority Member may maintain a similar website for the same purposes.

RULE II.—TIME OF MEETINGS

(A) Regular Meeting Date.—The regular meeting date and time for the transaction of business of the Full Committee shall be on the first Wednesday that the House is in Session each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

(B) Additional Meetings.—At the discretion of the Chairman, additional meetings of the Committee may be scheduled for the consideration of any bill or other matters pending before the Committee or to conduct other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(C) Consideration.—Except in the case of a special meeting held under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI, the determination of the business to be considered at each meeting of the Committee shall be made by the Chairman.

RULE III.—NOTICE AND PUBLICATION

(A) Notice.—

(1) Hearings.—The date, time, place and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee shall, except as provided in the Committee rules, be announced by notice at least one week in advance of the commencement of such hearing. The names of all witnesses scheduled to appear at such hearing shall be provided to Members no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of such hearing. These notice requirements may be waived by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

(2) Meetings.—The date, time, place and subject matter of any meeting, other than a hearing or a regularly scheduled meeting, shall be announced at least 36 hours in advance of a meeting to take place on a day the House is in session, and 72 hours in advance of a meeting to take place on a day the House is not in session, except in the case of a special meeting called under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. These notice requirements may be waived by the Chairman with the Concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

(a) Copies of any measure to be considered for approval by the Committee at any meeting, including any mark, print or amendment in the of a substitute shall be provided to the Members at least 24 hours in advance.

(b) The requirement in subsection (a) may be waived or abridged by the Chairman, with advance notice to the Ranking Minority Member.

(3) Publication.—The meeting or hearing announcement shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record. To the greatest extent practicable, meeting announcements shall be entered into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources.

**RULE IV.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS;
BROADCASTING**

(A) Open Meetings.—All meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public including to radio, television and still photography coverage, except as provided by Rule XI of the Rules of the House or when the Committee, in open session and with a Majority present, determines by recorded vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, compromise sensitive law enforcement information, tend to defame, degrade or incriminate a witness, or violate any law or role of the House of Representatives.

(B) Broadcasting.—Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee shall permit that hearing or meeting to be covered by television broadcast, internet broadcast, print media, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. Operation and use of any Committee operated broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House. Priority shall be given by the Committee to members of the Press Galleries.

(C) Transcripts.—A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during a Committee hearing. All transcripts of meetings or hearings that are open to the public shall be made available.

**RULE V.—PROCEDURES FOR MEETINGS AND
HEARINGS**

(A) Opening Statements.—At any meeting of the Committee, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall be entitled to present oral opening statements of five minutes each. Other Members may submit written opening statements for the record. The Chairman presiding over the meeting may permit additional opening statements by other Members of the Full Committee or of that subcommittee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

(B) The Five-Minute Rule.—The time any one Member may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration by the Committee shall not exceed five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chairman, except that this time limit may be extended when permitted by unanimous consent.

(C) Postponement of Vote.—The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed vote at any time, provided that all reasonable steps have been taken to notify Members of the resumption of such proceedings. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(D) Contempt Procedures.—No recommendation that a person cited for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House unless and until the Full Committee

has, upon notice to all its Members, met and considered the alleged contempt. The person to be cited for contempt shall be afforded, upon notice of at least 72 hours, an opportunity to state why he or she should not be held in contempt prior to a vote of the Full Committee, with a quorum being present, on the question whether to forward such recommendation to the House. Such statement shall be, in the discretion of the Chairman, either in writing or in person before the Full Committee.

RULE VI.—WITNESSES

(A) Questioning of Witnesses.—

(1) Questioning of witnesses by Members will be conducted under the five-minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion permitted by House Rule XI (2)(j)(2).

(2) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall first be recognized. In a subcommittee meeting or hearing, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee are then recognized. All other Members that arrive before the commencement of the meeting or hearing will be recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee, alternating between Majority and Minority Members. Committee Members arriving after the commencement of the hearing shall be recognized in order of appearance, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, after all Members present at the beginning of the hearing have been recognized. Each Member shall be recognized at least once before any Member is given a second opportunity to question a witness.

(3) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion may permit an extension of the period of questioning of a witness beyond five minutes but the time allotted must be equally apportioned to the Majority party and the Minority and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(4) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion may permit Committee staff of the Majority and Minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than 30 minutes for each side.

(B) Minority Witnesses.—Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the Minority party Members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a Majority of those Minority Members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(C) Oath or Affirmation.—The Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath or affirmation to any witness.

(D) Statements by Witnesses.—

(1) Consistent with the notice given, witnesses shall submit a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings (including, where practicable, an electronic copy) with the Clerk of the Committee no less than 48 hours in advance of the witness's appearance before the Committee. Unless the 48 hour requirement is waived or otherwise modified by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the failure to comply with this requirement may result in the exclusion of the written testimony from the hearing record and/or the barring of an oral presentation of the testimony.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, the written testimony of each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the

amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness to the extent that such information is relevant to the subject matter of, and the witness' representational capacity at, the hearing.

RULE VII.—QUORUM

Quorum Requirements.—Two Members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence. One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for conducting business, except for (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings to the public, pursuant to Committee Rule IV; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. The Chairman shall make reasonable efforts, including consultation with the Ranking Minority Member when scheduling meetings and hearings, to ensure that a quorum for any purpose will include at least one minority Member of the Committee.

RULE VIII.—DECORUM

(A) Breaches of Decorum.—The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, by censure and exclusion from the hearing; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(B) Access to Dais.—Access to the dais before, during and after a hearing, markup, or other meeting of the Committee shall be limited to Members and staff of the Committee. Subject to availability of space on the dais, a Member may have a personal staff present on the dais during periods when the Member is seated on the dais at the hearing.

(C) Wireless Communications Use Prohibited.—During a hearing, markup, or other meeting of the Committee, ringing or audible sounds or conversational use of cellular telephones or other electronic devices is prohibited in the Committee room.

RULE IX.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(A) Generally.—The Full Committee shall be organized into the following six standing subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Border, Maritime and Global counterterrorism;

(2) Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response;

(3) Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection;

(4) Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment;

(5) Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology; and

(6) Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight.

(B) Selection and Ratio of Subcommittee Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Full Committee shall select their respective Members of each subcommittee. The ratio of Majority to Minority Members shall be comparable to the ratio of Majority to Minority Members on the Full Committee, except that each subcommittee shall have at least two more Majority Members than Minority Members.

(C) Ex Officio Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall be ex officio members of each subcommittee but are not authorized to vote on matters that arise before each subcommittee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall not be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for any purpose other than taking testimony unless they are regular members of that subcommittee.

(D) Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.—Except as otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Full Committee, each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Full Committee on all matters within its purview. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chairman of the Full Committee. To the greatest extent practicable, no more than one meeting and hearing should be scheduled for a given time.

(E) Special Voting Provision.—If a tie vote occurs in a subcommittee on the question of reporting any measure to the Full Committee, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for Full Committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation.

(F) Task Force or Select Subcommittees.—The Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may create task forces of limited duration to carry out specifically enumerated duties and functions within the jurisdiction of the Committee subject to any limitations provided for in the House Rules or other Caucus or Conference Rules. Any task force created under this rule shall be subject to all applicable Committee and House rules and other laws in the conduct of its duties and functions.

RULE X.—REFERRALS TO SUBCOMMITTEES

Referral of Bills and Other Matters by Chairman.—Except for bills and other matters retained by the Chairman for Full Committee consideration, each bill or other matters referred to the Full Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to one or more subcommittees. In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Full Committee. Bills or other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned or discharged by the Chairman.

RULE XI.—SUBPOENAS

(A) Authorization.—Pursuant to clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the House, a subpoena may be authorized and issued under the seal of the House and attested by the Clerk of the House, and may be served by any person designated by the Full Committee for the furtherance of an investigation with authorization by—

(1) a majority of the Full Committee, a quorum being present; or

(2) the Chairman of the Full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of 3 days when, in the opinion of the Chairman of the Full Committee authorization and issuance of the subpoena is necessary to obtain the material or testimony set forth in the subpoena. The Chairman of the Full Committee shall notify Members of the Committee of the authorization and issuance of a subpoena under this rule as soon as practicable, but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

(B) Disclosure.—Provisions may be included in a subpoena with the concurrence of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, or by the Committee, to prevent the disclosure of the Full Committee's demands for information when deemed necessary for the security of information or the progress of an investigation, including but not limited to prohibiting the revelation by witnesses and their counsel of Full Committee's inquiries.

(C) Subpoena duces tecum.—A subpoena duces tecum may be issued whose return to the Committee Clerk shall occur at a time and place other than that of a regularly scheduled meeting.

(D) Affidavits and Depositions.—The Chairman of the Full Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, or the Committee may authorize the taking of an affidavit or deposition with respect to any person who is subpoenaed under these rules but who is unable to appear in person to testify as a witness at any hearing or meeting. Notices for the taking of depositions shall specify the date, time and place of examination. Depositions shall be taken under oath administered by a Member or a person otherwise authorized by law to administer oaths. Prior consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall include written notice three business days before any deposition is scheduled to provide an opportunity for Minority staff to be present during the questioning.

RULE XII.—COMMITTEE STAFF

(A) Generally.—Committee staff members are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of House Rule X and must be eligible to be considered for routine access to classified information.

(B) Staff Assignments.—For purposes of these rules, Committee staff means the employees of the Committee, detailees, fellows or any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee. All such persons shall be either Majority, Minority, or shared staff. The Chairman shall appoint, determine remuneration of, supervise and may remove Majority staff. The Ranking Minority Member shall appoint, determine remuneration of, supervise and may remove Minority staff. In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may appoint, determine remuneration of, supervise and may remove shared staff that is assigned to service of the Committee. The Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments, including appointments by the Ranking Minority Member, as required.

(C) Divulgence of Information.—Prior to the public acknowledgment by the Chairman or the Committee of a decision to initiate an investigation of a particular person, entity, or subject, no member of the Committee staff shall knowingly divulge to any person any information, including non-classified information, which comes into his or her possession by virtue of his or her status as a member of the Committee staff, if the member of the Committee staff has a reasonable expectation that such information may alert the subject of a Committee investigation to the existence, nature, or substance of such investigation, unless authorized to do so by the Chairman or the Committee.

RULE XIII.—MEMBER AND STAFF TRAVEL

(A) Approval of Travel.—Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any Member or any Committee staff shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Member and any Committee staff only in connection with official Committee business, such as the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee and meetings, conferences, site visits, and investigations that involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Full Committee.

(1) Proposed Travel by Majority Party Members and Staff.—In the case of proposed travel by Majority party Members or Committee staff, before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following: (a) the purpose of the travel; (b) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of

the event for which the travel is being made; (c) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and (d) the names of Members and staff seeking authorization. On the basis of that information, the Chairman shall determine whether the proposed travel is for official Committee business, concerns subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee, and is not excessively costly in view of the Committee business proposed to be conducted.

(2) Proposed Travel by Minority Party Members and Staff.—In the case of proposed travel by Minority party Members or Committee staff, the Ranking Minority Member shall provide to the Chairman a written representation setting forth the information specified in items (a), (b), (c), and (d) of subparagraph (1) and his or her determination that such travel complies with the other requirements of subparagraph (1).

(B) Foreign Travel.—All Committee Member and staff requests for Committee-funded foreign travel must be submitted to the Chairman, through the Chief Financial Officer of the Committee, not less than seven business days prior to the start of the travel. Within 60 days of the conclusion of any such foreign travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the Chairman a written report summarizing the information gained as a result of the travel in question, or other Committee objectives served by such travel.

RULE XIV.—CLASSIFIED AND OTHER CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

(A) Security Precautions.—Committee staff offices, including Majority and Minority offices, shall operate under strict security precautions administered by the Security Officer of the Committee. A security officer shall be on duty at all times during normal office hours. Classified documents and sensitive but unclassified (SBU) documents (including but not limited to those marked with dissemination restrictions such as Sensitive Security Information (SSI), Law Enforcement Sensitive (LES), For Official Use Only (FOUO), or Critical Infrastructure Information (CII) may be examined only in an appropriately secure manner. Such documents may be removed from the Committee's offices in furtherance of official Committee business. Appropriate security procedures shall govern the handling of such documents removed from the Committee's offices.

(B) Temporary Custody of Executive Branch Material.—Executive branch documents or other materials containing classified information in any form that were not made part of the record of a Committee hearing, did not originate in the Committee or the House, and are not otherwise records of the Committee shall, while in the custody of the Committee, be segregated and maintained by the Committee in the same manner as Committee records that are classified. Such documents and other materials shall be returned to the Executive branch agency from which they were obtained at the earliest practicable time.

(C) Access by Committee Staff.—Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to Committee staff members with appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know, as determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and under their direction of the Majority and Minority Staff Directors.

(D) Maintaining Confidentiality.—No Member of the Committee or Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part or by way of summary, to any person who is not a Member of the Committee or an authorized member of Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, any testimony given before

the Committee in executive session. Classified information and sensitive but unclassified (SBU) information (including but not limited to documents marked with dissemination restrictions such as Sensitive Security Information (SSI), Law Enforcement Sensitive (LES), For Official Use Only (FOUO), or Critical Infrastructure Information (CII) shall be handled in accordance with all applicable provisions of law and consistent with the provisions of these rules.

(E) Oath.—Before a Member or Committee staff member may have access to classified information, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any classified information received in the course of my service on the Committee on Homeland Security, except as authorized by the Committee or the House of Representatives or in accordance with the Rules of such Committee or the Rules of the House."

Copies of the executed oath (or affirmation) shall be retained by the Clerk as part of the records of the Committee.

(F) Disciplinary Action.—The Chairman shall immediately consider disciplinary action in the event any Committee Member or member of the Committee staff fails to conform to the provisions of these rules governing the disclosure of classified or unclassified information. Such disciplinary action may include, but shall not be limited to, immediate dismissal from the Committee staff, criminal referral to the Justice Department, and notification of the Speaker of the House. With respect to Minority party staff, the Chairman shall consider such disciplinary action in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE XV.—COMMITTEE RECORDS

(A) Committee Records.—Committee Records shall constitute all data, charts and files in possession of the Committee and shall be maintained in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(e).

(B) Legislative Calendar.—The Clerk of the Committee shall maintain a printed calendar for the information of each Committee Member showing any procedural or legislative measures considered or scheduled to be considered by the Committee, and the status of such measures and such other matters as the Committee determines shall be included. The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes. A copy of such revisions shall be made available to each Member of the Committee upon request.

(C) Members Right To Access.—Members of the Committee and of the House shall have access to all official Committee Records. Access to Committee files shall be limited to examination within the Committee offices at reasonable times. Access to Committee Records that contain classified information shall be provided in a manner consistent with these rules.

(D) Removal of Committee Records.—Files and records of the Committee are not to be removed from the Committee offices. No Committee files or records that are not made publicly available shall be photocopied by any Member.

(E) Executive Session Records.—Evidence or testimony received by the Committee in executive session shall not be released or made available to the public unless agreed to by the Committee. Members may examine the Committee's executive session records, but may not make copies of, or take personal notes from, such records.

(F) Public Inspection.—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action including recorded votes. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of each amendment, motion, order or other proposition and

the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against each such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, as well as the names of those Members present but not voting. Such record shall be made available to the public at reasonable times within the Committee offices.

(G) Separate and Distinct.—All Committee records and files must be kept separate and distinct from the office records of the Members serving as Chairman and Ranking Minority Member. Records and files of Members' personal offices shall not be considered records or files of the Committee.

(H) Disposition of Committee Records.—At the conclusion of each Congress, non-current records of the Committee shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House.

(I) Archived Records.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee. The Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member on any communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of noncurrent records pursuant to clause 3(b) of the Rule.

RULE XVI.—CHANGES TO COMMITTEE RULES

These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Full Committee provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been given to each Member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken.

OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored and pleased to be able to come to the House floor once again with another version, another edition of what we call the Official Truth Squad.

The role of the Official Truth Squad is to attempt to try to bring some honesty and factual information to the floor of the House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, oftentimes that is difficult to find. Today was no exception on the floor of the House as we tried to, through the debate we had, make sure that facts were being presented and information was reliable upon which people make their decisions was being presented.

I am honored by the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle to come to the floor tonight and share with the American people and talk about issues that are of great concern, some of which have been dealt with as recently as today.

On the Official Truth Squad, we have a favorite quote which comes from Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who was a United States Senator from New York.

He said, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts."

Mr. Speaker, no place could that ring more true than right here in the halls of Congress. We get a lot of opportunity to observe process here. We talk about process a lot. We talk about rules a lot. Many people say, what difference does that make? What difference do the rules make? And a lot of people, many people, say, on my side, say you don't want to talk about process. It is difficult for the American people to understand or appreciate.

But what process does in a democratic institution, and this being the finest democratic institution in the world, the people's House, what process does is allow all voices to be heard and allow all points of view to be heard.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if you think about it and if my friends on both sides of the aisle would think about it, we all appreciate that we don't have Republican challenges or Republican problems or Democrat problems or Democrat challenges. We have American challenges, American challenges that are best solved when we all work together and come up with the best and most correct solution for our Nation.

But, sadly, Mr. Speaker, we haven't had much of that with this new Congress. That is, the opportunity to have input into the process. Again, the reason that the process is so important, because if you lock people out of the ability to have input into the process, then what happens, the individuals, the citizens, the American citizens that those people represent, those people who are locked out of the process, those American citizens are without a voice. They don't have a voice in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is not only unfair, it is undemocratic, and so I would respectfully suggest to my friends on the other side of the aisle that they ought to look at the rules that they have adopted and they ought to look at the process that they have gone through for these first 3 or 4 weeks that we have been in Congress and try to be true to their principles, or their stated principles, and make certain that all folks are able to be involved in the process. Because it makes a difference. It does indeed make a difference.

Today, we took up on the floor of the House what was called a continuing resolution. It was, in fact, an omnibus bill. It was a spending bill.

The last Congress, the one that was in place prior to the beginning of this month, the House did its job from a financial standpoint relatively efficiently. We passed all of our spending bills, appropriations bills, to try to figure out how to spend the hard-earned money from the taxpayer. We got our business done pretty quickly.

The bills that we sent over to the Senate sat there and sat there and sat there. Consequently, what happened

was we came to the end of 2006 and there was no agreement between the Senate and the House about those appropriations bills. So what we passed was a continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution that we passed, which was truly a continuing resolution, which just meant that you continued to spend the same amount of money in the programs that were in place in the Federal Government; and to do that it doesn't take much language. In fact, the bill was two short pages. If you had a little larger page, it would be one page. Because all it says in legal terms is we will continue to spend the amount of money that we spent last year. That bill runs the government spending through February 15.

So something else had to be done; and the other side said, we will do a continuing resolution. We will continue spending money at the same rate on the same programs because their committees haven't got up and running. They cannot figure out exactly what the process ought to be to allow people to have input into it, so we will just have a continuing resolution. So they presented their, quote, continuing resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that continuing resolution I have here, this H.J. Res, is 137 pages long.

Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. It is not an opinion, that is a fact.

Now the continuing resolution that could continue the spending for our Nation, responsible spending at the lowest possible level given the amount of spending that has occurred over the past number of months of this fiscal year, could just be continued with a two-page resolution that says, yes, indeed, we will continue that spending.

In fact, what the majority party has done is passed a 137-page omnibus bill. It is not a continuing resolution in spite of what they say. The reason that is important is the process was not in place to allow input by almost anybody. Not just Republicans, but Democrats as well, and certainly freshmen Democrats, had no input into the process.

What is in this bill is all sorts of special spending, picking winners and losers and rewarding friends in this bill that the other side, the Democrat majority side, says is just a continuing resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have some principles on our side, and one of them is that no process deserves more public scrutiny than the way in which the hard-earned taxpayer money is spent. No process deserves more scrutiny than the way in which hard-earned taxpayer money is spent.

In fact, what happened today is the spending or the concurrence by the House of Representatives, the vast majority of them being Democrat, that we would spend \$463 billion, that is with a "B", Mr. Speaker, \$463 billion on the omnibus bill that they have presented.

And there are so many things that we would like to talk about tonight that

relate to process and to policy, and I am pleased to be joined by good friends who will highlight some of those items.

A member of the Official Truth Squad, a Member who brings highlight and honesty to our deliberations joins me this evening, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN). I appreciate your being with us, and I look forward to your comments.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. He does such a wonderful job of pulling the Truth Squad together and helping us focus on the issues that are important to our constituents and of concern to our constituents and of concern to all Americans.

Certainly the process that we have seen carried out here in the House of Representatives is one that causes us concern. For those of us who respect regular order, who respect the integrity of the House, to see an omnibus spending bill go straight from the drafting table of a couple of Members, one in the Senate and one in the House, and then come directly to the floor for a vote is of tremendous concern.

□ 1715

We all know that our Nation has a process that was laid forth in the founding of this Nation, a process by which this body would conduct its business on behalf of the people, the people's House. Today, as I heard some of my colleagues across the aisle talk about how we had returned to regular order, I thought, oh, my goodness, I do not think this is what people had in mind.

I really do not think, Mr. Speaker, that when people went to the polls in November and voted and said we want to see a change in things, we want greater accountability, we want greater transparency and we are frustrated with what we have seen in Washington. I do not think this is what they had in mind, and certainly we would hope this is not the process that the Democrat majority will follow as they talk about what is going to be regular order.

What the gentleman from Georgia just said about the omnibus is so very true. As he said, this is a continuing resolution. It requires two sheets of paper. It is a total of about 40 lines of type. That is it. It just says we abide by the budget that was in place in 2006. Our constituents may remember that the budget that we passed in 2006 was the budget that made 1 percent across-the-board reductions in spending, 1 percent. It was a \$40 billion savings to the American people.

Now, the budget, this omnibus budget, this 137 pages is going to end up spending about \$17 billion more. So they are reducing and doing away with the savings that we worked hard to put in place.

The thing that is of tremendous concern to me, and I am so delighted to see the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) who is such an advocate for our military and is really, having

chaired our Armed Services Committee, speaks so well to that issue and I know he is going to talk about it, but it just breaks my heart to know that our National Guard troops and our troops at Ft. Campbell, which is located in my district, are going to have far less money for quality of life because of the actions that were taken in this budget and the way in this budget, in this document, H.J. Res. 20, and people can go online and pull this up and look, and how they have taken from military quality of life, money that should be going to our military families and have moved that to other departments; how they took money from our military quality of life, \$50 million, and that is given to the Palestinian Authority. That is something that with my constituents has certainly raised a lot of questions.

The thing that interested me when it came to the issue of the earmarks was they had said, oh, no earmarks are going to be in this budget, and then I found out that, well, there were earmarks that were in the budget. Nevada seems to have earmarks. Other States seem to have some curious earmarks that are left in there, but then there are funds that are turned back to the agencies.

I said, well, how does this money get spent? Is it done with letters of instruction? How is it done? What I found out was that the process that they would revert to, and I guess this is regular order, would be the process before money started being earmarked. It is where you pick up the phone and you call the agency and say let me tell you how I think we need to spend that money.

My constituents long ago said they did not want the activities of smoke-filled rooms. They wanted more transparency and the American people wanted to see greater accountability, and I think that we will continue to hear from our constituents. They want a smaller budget that is going to be more responsible of their money. This is not our money. It is the taxpayers' money. Government does not have a revenue problem. With the tax reductions that have been passed, the Federal Government has brought in more money than ever.

What government has is a spending problem. It has a priority problem, and this big, bloated budget that was passed today is a budget that will continue to fund a bloated bureaucracy that just cannot get enough of our constituents' money.

I was disappointed today with the actions of the majority. I was disappointed in how they chose to carry it out. I do hope that we see a change in the way they carried forth, and to the gentleman from Georgia, I will tell you, I hope that we continue to see a return to a respect for how we address the people's business in this House.

We talked some about one man, one vote and the sanctity of that and the importance of that, and I do hope that

everyone will continue to keep their focus on being certain that we respect that for our constituents.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much. I appreciate your perspective and your insight and your wonderful words about accountability, because that is really what it is all about, Mr. Speaker. It is about accountability. It is about holding people here in this House accountable for what they said they were going to do.

Elections are wonderful things. Every 2 years, the American people get to go to the polls and they get to say we like how things are going and we want to support that or we think there ought to be a change. In November of last year, the American people voted for change, but I do not believe, as I know my good friend from Tennessee does not believe, that the American people voted for higher spending or greater deficits, which is what the Democrat majority in the House of Representatives today adopted.

I do know also that they did not vote to decrease money for our armed services, for our military men and women who are working as hard as they can, day and night, to make certain they keep us safe. In fact, what they have done indeed with this bill that was adopted today is to decrease the amount of revenue available for our fighting men and women and especially the base realignment and closure which is what gives the efficiency to the system.

Nobody knows about that better than the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee than my good friend from California, the honorable DUNCAN HUNTER, and I appreciate so much his taking part in this hour this evening. I look forward to your comments.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Georgia for letting me come in and offer something that I did not see offered by the Democrat side in this debate, which was the Army's position on this continuing resolution.

In fact, they posited this continuing resolution as motherhood, apple pie and everything that we need for a strong national defense, and they invoked the interest of American veterans. What they did not tell American veterans was that the Army sees this as a real problem and a real cut in benefits, and things that would help the active Army come in this defense realignment, this base realignment with divisions coming back to the United States, divisions like the big red one coming back to Ft. Riley, Kansas, and lots of others and lots of quality-of-life programs for the men and women of the armed services and for their families.

What we did not see coming from the Democrat side of the aisle was the fact that they reached over with one hand to give money to one group of servicemembers of veterans; they reached

over and scooped money out of the cash register that would accrue to the benefit of another group, a very important people, and this is the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States.

So let me give you the Army's perspective as manifested in a letter from Lieutenant General David Melcher, United States Army, Military Deputy for Budget, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller. He says this:

"You recently requested a quick summary of Base Realignment and Closure impacts to the Army as proposed in the Joint Resolution, H.J. Res. 20." That is the resolution that the Democrat side of the aisle just passed. "The attached information accurately portrays these impacts. The following identifies key Army concerns:

One, "Army will not begin with approximately \$2 billion of our BRAC program, which is a key enabler to grow and position the Army; this leaves more than half of our fiscal year 2007 BRAC program unexecutable."

Number 2, "Operational Impact on the Training, Mobilization and Deployment of Forces in support of the Global War on Terrorism." For some reason, the Democrat side of the aisle did not quite want to show that statement by the U.S. Army, that their bill that they passed, their continuing resolution, would, in fact, impact training, mobilization and deployment of forces in support of the global war on terrorism.

Number 3, "Unravels the Army's synchronized stationing and BRAC plan, puts growth of the Army, stationing, and BRAC at risk." That means this: We are bringing back divisions from around the world. Places like Germany are now going to see movement in which American divisions are going to come back, and they are going to be repositioned in the United States. That means you got to go out and build barracks. You have got to go out and build single family housing. You have got to put a lot of construction in place. The Democrat majority reached out and took away part of that money.

Number 4, "Delays transformation of Reserve Component, has operational consequences." We are involved in two shooting wars, and we have now done something that has operational consequences.

Number 5, "Breaks the Nation's obligation to provide Soldiers and Families adequate quality of life, affects the All Volunteer Force," something we did not hear from the other side of the aisle.

Number 6, "Delays capital investment and inhibits economic development, affects local jobs and growth across the U.S." Over 80,000 jobs affected by what they just did.

And lastly, "Limits predictability and military construction acquisition efficiencies, results in higher construction costs."

So, as we see costs going through the roof, the contractors can say, yep, we

were going to build that single family housing for those military families but you guys reached in, took a bunch of the money out; we had to give a stop work order to our crews, and now we are going to charge you, the American taxpayers, more money.

I have got another executive summary here that goes into more detail, and I thought it might just be good to give a few of the examples of this money that was cut by the Democrat majority, which they skipped over very quickly, and tell the American people a few details about these projects that they moved off the table with one push of the hand.

Training ranges, command and control, training barracks, 19 projects, \$560 million, including training facilities at Fort Bliss, Texas; maneuver training at Fort Benning, Georgia; air defense artillery at Fort Sill; and battlefield trauma lab at Fort Sam Houston. In fact, I have been to the battlefield trauma lab. That is where we train our combat medics to save lives in the war fighting theaters in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Cannot start communications/electronics, RD&E, center phase one at APG, that is Aberdeen Proving Ground, to close Fort Monmouth and support the global war on terrorism.

Cannot start on human resources command at Fort Knox, Kentucky; recruiting facilities at Redstone Arsenal; power projection platform at Ft. Riley or other operational projects at Shaw Air Force Base, Benning and Leavenworth.

Armed Forces reserve centers, 27 projects, \$700 million in 16 States.

Examples of fiscal year 2007 BRAC quality of life requirements, eight projects, youth and child development centers, Benning, Riley, Bliss, Sam Houston; dental clinics, Bliss, Sam Houston; medical clinic, Ft. Riley, Kansas. That is where the big red one is returning from Europe.

All fiscal year 2007 BRAC projects and follow-on MILCON are synchronized with modular force build, operational rotations, BRAC and GDPR.

What that means is that we are now trying to produce some 42 combat brigades, and we are trying to modularize them so they have the same equipment, they have got the same training, so that they are interchangeable so you can move out with a combat fighting force and you can move a brigade in from another area and you can have that from another particular division and that brigade is interchangeable. It does not have equipment that is noninteroperable, and it means you can fight more effectively and more consistently.

□ 1730

That modularity has been hampered by these cuts. So these are the cuts that were made by the Democrat majority, pushed off the table, projects pushed off the table with one push of

the hand and with barely a mention on the Democrat side.

So I would just say, my friend from Georgia, glad you got that sign up there, Official Truth Squad. You know, I think sometimes it is important to know the entire story. That is a part of the real story about what we did today.

I thank the gentleman for letting me come down and talk a little bit about the Army's position and the Army's position against the cuts that were manifested in this continuing resolution.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his insight. Nobody knows more about these issues than you and I. I appreciate you bringing that perspective.

You mention a number of items. You said there was barely a mention about this. I was listening pretty closely. I didn't hear a single word about it from the other side that talked about the cuts that are in place.

Mr. HUNTER. No.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And that things were skipped over quickly. They were. We had 1 hour of debate on a \$463 billion appropriations bill. Phenomenal. Phenomenal when you think about it.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me tell you something.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Please.

Mr. HUNTER. The other side tried to appeal to the hearts of American veterans. I am a veteran. But you know something else? I have a son who just did 4 years of active duty with the U.S. Marine Corps, trained at some of these bases that we are talking about, witnessed and was training sometimes in facilities that were somewhat deficient, that needed to be improved.

I will bet you, if you look in the family of every American veteran that the other side was playing to, in passing the CR and saying we are doing good things for you guys, for you old guys like me, they were not doing good things for our sons. Because our sons are on active duty right now. They need to have that quality of life for our military families.

I can remember being with my son as Lynne and I would follow them around the United States, as a lot of military moms and dads do, trying desperately to get a little time with our grandchildren, and we would be often in substandard housing. We would see the efforts that had been undertaken by DOD to upgrade housing and to upgrade facilities and to make life better for families. A lot of those programs are in those cuts that the Democrats side of the aisle just made.

So if you are playing to us old veterans, remember, there is another thing that is very near and dear to us old veterans, and that is our kids who are on active duty or recently on active duty. We are concerned about them. So don't take away from them to give to us on the basis that we will then appreciate it, and we will appreciate them, and we somehow will not

look at the reductions that they made to the active force. The active force and its benefits are very, very important to every veteran.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Those are facts.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask to insert in the RECORD the letter from Lieutenant General Melcher.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
THE ARMY,

Washington, DC, January 31, 2007.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HUNTER: Sir, you recently requested a quick summary of Base Realignment and Closure impacts to the Army as proposed in the Joint Resolution H.J. Res. 20. The attached information accurately portrays these impacts. The following identifies key Army concerns:

Army will not begin with approximately \$2.0 B of our BRAC program which is a key enabler to grow and position the Army; this leaves more than half of our FY07 BRAC program (56%) unexecutable

Operational impact on the Training, Mobilization, and Deployment of Forces in support of the Global War on Terrorism

Unravels the Army's synchronized stationing and BRAC plan—puts growth of the Army, stationing, and BRAC at risk

Delays transformation of Reserve Component—has operational consequences

Breaks the Nation's obligation to provide Soldiers and Families adequate quality of life—affects the All Volunteer Force

Delays capital investment and inhibits economic development—affects local jobs and growth across the U.S. (over 80,000 jobs)

Limits predictability and military construction acquisition efficiencies—results in higher construction costs

I trust this information is helpful.

Sincerely,

DAVID F. MELCHER,
Lieutenant General,
U.S. Army, Military
Deputy for Budget,
Assistant Secretary
of the Army, Financial
Management
and Comptroller.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I also want to highlight a statement in a letter from the Office of Management and Budget from the Executive Office of the President about these BRAC closings, because I think that it highlights one of the very egregious activities that occurred in passing this omnibus, this appropriations bill, that the Democrat majority did today.

It says, quote, the President's budget requested \$5.6 billion to implement the recommendations of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission.

That is something that all of us had voted on here on the floor of the House.

The administration strongly opposes the committee's reduction of \$3.1 billion from the President's request.

Remember, this is \$3.1 billion cut out of a \$5.6 billion appropriation.

This will, quote, significantly delay BRAC implementation, increase the risk that the Department of Defense would not meet its statutory deadline to implement BRAC, reduce BRAC sav-

ings, delay or postpone scheduled redeployments of military personnel.

Did you hear that? Delay or postpone scheduled redeployments of military personnel and their overseas stations to the United States and negatively impact many specific plans in response to BRAC.

So, in addition to the challenges and the difficulties that we have in trying to make certain that our men and women have anything at their resource to be able to fight this global war on terror, I doubt that anybody on the other side of the aisle, when they ran for office last November, said, boy, I sure want to cut the military's budget as they fight the global war on terror. I doubt that happened, but, in fact, that is exactly what happened on the floor of the House today.

What we are here to do today, as The Official Truth Squad, is to make certain that we hold people accountable. There are people watching. There are people listening. The American people know that there are two different philosophies of how government ought to work. We have a philosophy that it ought to be efficient, that it ought to be as small as possible, that it ought to respect individuals, that it ought to strongly support the global war on terror in our military.

Our good friends on the other side of the aisle oftentimes talk like that. But when it gets right down to votes, that is not how they vote. We are here today to bring some facts to the issue and some accountability.

I am so pleased to be joined by my good friend from Texas, who was past budget chairman for the Republican Study Committee during the last term and this year has assumed the helm of the Chair of the Republican Study Committee, I think one of the finest groups of individuals in this Congress, the individuals who are as concerned as anybody that I know about economic responsibility, financial responsibility, and accountability for this Congress.

I thank you for joining us this evening and look forward to your comments.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman, and I certainly appreciate his great work as a Member from Georgia. We particularly participate his participation in the Republican Study Committee, the conservative caucus within this caucus.

It has been a rather interesting day here on the House floor. I didn't know that it was possible, but apparently our Democrat colleagues created a new record in the House. Now, I am still doing my homework. Maybe they just came in second or third place. But if I did my homework correctly, never in the history of America has a Congress spent more money with less accountability than this Democrat Congress did today just a few hours ago, \$463 billion spent in 1 hour, 1 hour of debate to spend \$463 billion.

Now, I have been a Member of Congress for a while, but, ladies and gentlemen, that is still real money. That

is \$7.7 billion per minute that this Democrat majority managed to spend. We just heard from the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. Apparently, they didn't spend it very well. They seemed to have forgotten the war fighter and his quality of life when they were putting this massive spending bill together.

Now, earlier, as the Democrats took control of the institution, and elections have consequences, I understand that, they won fair and square, but Speaker PELOSI is on the record shortly after the election saying, quote, Democrats believe we must return to accountability by restoring fiscal discipline and eliminating, eliminating, deficit spending. Now this is the Democrat leader, the Speaker of the House, telling the American people that this was their intention. So now we spend \$463 billion in 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, families all across America will spend more time deliberating on the purchase of a washer and dryer than this institution did in spending \$463 billion of their money, their hard-earned money. It is somewhat mind-boggling to spend that much money with such little accountability.

Now, let's talk about the Speaker telling the American people that she and the Democrats were going to eliminate deficit spending.

Well, as this bill passed earlier today, if the Senate takes it up, all of a sudden every American's share of the public debt has gone from \$28,860 to \$30,399. Now, I didn't major in math at Texas A&M University, but I can figure out, if you are trying to eliminate deficit spending, you are headed in the wrong direction, which makes me kind of question why you passed this bill in the first place.

Now, the American people were led to believe that this body was going to pass something called a continuing resolution. Now, I understand that is kind of inside baseball, but what it says is, you know, we are going to continue government at the same funding level. There are families all across America who face hardships who have to actually get by on less. A continuing resolution actually says, we are going to, frankly, grow government under the baseline, what we did last year.

Had this institution done it, which is what they led the American people to believe, we would have had a continuing resolution which, by the way, fits on a single piece of paper. Instead, we had a 150 page, I believe it was 150 pages, of what we call an omnibus, everything thrown into a massive spending bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats told us, they led us to believe we were going to have this continuing resolution. We end up with this omnibus. They tell us we are going to eliminate deficit spending. Instead, they increased deficit spending. They tell us they are going to have accountability; and, instead, we spend 1 hour, 1 hour debating the expenditure of \$463 billion.

Let me tell you what else they told us. They told us there would be no earmarks. You know, these are these little perks that Members of Congress take for their own district. Well, at last count, there was near 30 earmarks. Now, maybe they are good earmarks, maybe they are bad earmarks, but don't tell us there aren't going to be any earmarks in the bill and then put them there.

I mean, they are the poster children, too often. They are the poster children of fiscal irresponsibility. We have the golden oldie here. The rain forest in Iowa has made another appearance here. Now somebody earlier today said, well, that is a Republican earmark. Well, at least they acknowledge that earmarks were in the bill.

Last I looked, the Democrats have a majority in the House; they have a majority in the Senate. Obviously, it would not be in the bill unless Democrats wanted it in the bill.

We also had this institution pass a continuing resolution instead of this omnibus. Also, we would have saved \$6.2 billion of American families' money. That is what would have happened had the Democrat majority done what they told the American people they were going to do. That is \$6.2 billion that could have been applied to, again, quote, unquote, eliminating deficit spending.

So they had an opportunity to put their actions where their words were, and they didn't do it. They had extra money, and they spent it.

Again, as the gentleman from California illuminated, they didn't spend it very well. They certainly didn't consider the quality of life for the war fighter when they were putting together this omnibus.

Also, we were told there would not be any gimmicks. We would have accountability. Well, we look in here and there is gimmicks. There is \$3.5 billion here. Now, this is inside baseball, I admit it, but I have served on the Budget Committee for 4 years, and I am starting to recognize these gimmicks.

But they put \$3.5 billion here by rescinding contract authority for highway programs without decreasing what we call obligation limitations. Then, again, I know that is inside baseball. But let me tell you, what happens is there is no savings. They are claiming savings where there are none.

They also make a one-time change, a one-year change in what we call entitlement spending. Again, it is a trick. It is smoke and mirrors. It will not be there.

Where is the accountability? I am looking for it. Clearly, we need that magnifying glass of The Official Truth Squad, because nobody can find the vaunted Democrat accountability that we were told would be here.

There is a better way. We can have true fiscal accountability.

Another gentleman, a colleague of mine from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), offered an amendment that would have

given us that continuing resolution that would have saved us \$6.2 billion that would have done what the Democrats told the American people they were going to do. But their Rules Committee said, no, we are not going to allow that one. That is kind of a dicey vote. That one was never allowed on the floor, the one that would actually use \$6.2 billion to help reduce this deficit.

Another thing we can do is embrace the President's call for a balanced budget in 5 years without raising taxes. Now, that is true fiscal responsibility. I would hope that all Members of this Congress could sign up for that program.

Now, Democrats will tell us that all the tax relief that was passed on our watch is the source of every fiscal problem known to mankind. Well, as a member of the Budget Committee, we have now received testimony from the head of the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, we have received testimony from the head of the Congressional Budget Office. It is not what we hear from them.

□ 1745

What we hear, Mr. Speaker, is that until we do something to help reform entitlement spending and Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security and work on a bipartisan basis to get better retirement security, better health care at a lower cost, that is the fiscal challenge to America.

And, by the way, there is an inconvenient fact for our Democrat colleagues, and that inconvenient fact is we have cut marginal rates. We have cut capital gains. And guess what? We have more tax revenue than we have had in the entire history of America. If you allow the American people to keep more of what they earn, they will save it. They will invest it. They will go out and expand businesses. They will create small businesses. They will put out a new barbecue stand. They will do a new transmission repair shop. And now we have created over 7 million new jobs with a future.

Now, I know maybe their goal for America is 7 million new welfare checks. But the Republican goal for America was 7 million new paychecks. And under our watch, that is what we achieved. Seven million new paychecks and the greatest amount of tax revenue that we have had in the history of America. We are awash in tax revenue. That is why the deficit is coming down.

Now, I am not here to tell you that every time you design tax relief that it creates more tax revenue, but if you do it right, particularly if you put it on the side of helping working families and helping entrepreneurs to save and invest, it will more than pay for itself, and that is what has been done here. But now, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats want to take that tax relief away. They say it is bad. They want to take the 7 million jobs away. And what is really humorous is that they want to

take really the tax revenue away that this explosion of economic activity has created in the first place.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are many ways that we can embrace true fiscal responsibility. But to spend \$463 billion of the people's money with no hearing, with almost no debate, in 1 hour, to set the land speed record for spending money in the shortest period of time, today the Democrats get the gold medal, the gold medal, in that Olympic competition. Never has more money been spent in less time than today. So how they expect to live up to Speaker PELOSI's goal of eliminating deficit spending, restoring fiscal discipline, and return to accountability, I suggest they enter a different Olympics and try to spend less money with more accountability, and that is something that the American people could truly respect.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas so much for his wonderful cogent comments. And talking about the individuals on the other side of the aisle, who have indeed said one thing and then come here and done another, one would think that they are beginning to foster a culture of hypocrisy. That kind of has a little ring to it that rings true on the other side of the aisle.

I do want to thank you as well for your comments about tax revenue. Sometimes a picture tells a better story than words, although your words were cogent and so appropriate.

But this graph helps me understand the benefits of tax decreases, Mr. Speaker. When you decrease taxes, which is what we did here in Congress in 2001 and 2003, this line here is revenue to the Federal Government and what happened was that the revenue was going down, but we decreased taxes appropriately, as the gentleman from Texas said, and what happens is that the revenue goes up. The Federal Government, in fact, gets more revenue because there is more economic activity, more economic vitality.

We have touched on so many things tonight. My good friend from Virginia has joined us. We are running a little short on time, but I do want to make certain that you get an opportunity to join us for the Official Truth Squad and make some comments possibly about BRAC.

My good friend from Virginia, THELMA DRAKE, is just so wonderfully active here in Congress and so cogent and appropriate on issues of the military, representing the military installations in southeast Virginia.

So I welcome you and look forward to your comments.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for recognizing me tonight, and I would like to apologize for being late for your hour. But as I was coming over here today, I was connected by my office to a constituent who is serving in Iraq right now. I stood out in that hallway just beyond those doors and had a conversa-

tion with him with much better reception than I usually get on a local call from my cell phone. So it was absolutely remarkable, and I just wanted to share with you a little bit of what he said.

First of all, he is a contracting officer working with our reconstruction teams. I asked him, because we often hear that we are not employing Iraqis, that these are all major companies that are doing this work. He was quite surprised that I asked that question. He said that we have an "Iraqi First" program, and all jobs are offered first to Iraqi companies and to Iraqis, and if they can't perform that job, then other companies from other countries are brought in. They are completely screened. He even has an Iraqi who works with him on staff.

I asked if he had a message for us tonight. And the answer was that he asked us not to forget them.

I think that brings up the issue you just mentioned, Mr. PRICE, that what just happened today on the House floor. And what we know and the Department of Defense is now putting out information that there was a \$3 billion reduction in the funds that have been appropriated in the bills that both of these bodies had passed for 2007. Not for those but for the military construction, the bills that the House had passed and had not been passed by the Senate.

So we heard on the floor here today that that was not a reduction. It was actually an increase. That is not the way that this is being viewed, and it is not the impact that it would have on people who are serving today.

But Mr. PRICE and Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that there is no one in America, no one in Congress that wants America to be at war. There is no President that wants to be a war President. And I have said to people if I believed this war we are engaged in was about democracy in Iraq or about a people who have fought each other for centuries, I would oppose this war, too.

But it is a war about our civilization with an enemy who has vowed to kill us and to end our way of life, an enemy who has attacked us and who works and plots constantly to attack us again. I truly believe if Americans just had the facts that they would make the right decision.

My constituent said it very clearly. He said we cannot let this enemy win. And every Iraqi that I have ever talked with, this is something America never hears and I think if they did hear it, it would make a difference, but from President Talabani on down, whether they are Iraqis I have met when I have been on trips there or Iraqis here, they all say, "we are grateful to America for our freedom." And we, as Americans, never get to hear that.

The real question is what are our options? To let this enemy win and to say that they defeated the Russians in Afghanistan and the Americans in Iraq?

What would that do to us? What would that do to our allies, and who would ever believe us again?

And if we were to make that decision and to allow this enemy to win and pull our troops out of Iraq before the Iraqis are ready to govern and secure themselves, the real question is how will we manage the cost of this defeat? How will we manage the murder of all those Iraqis who have joined in the freedom of Iraq, the person who was working for my constituent right now, those who have served in government, in the police, in the Iraqi security forces?

Thank you for yielding. I know you have a lot to talk about, and I appreciate the work that you are doing on the floor.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you ever so much, Congresswoman DRAKE. We appreciate your heartfelt words and the message from your constituent and that perspective on what truly is a portion of this global war on terror. The incredible importance of making certain that we as a Congress and we as a people support our men and women at every turn. So I thank you very, very much.

And that highlights what happened today on this floor about the appropriations bill, the omnibus bill, that the other side of the aisle, the Democrat majority, passed. And, in fact, what they have done is made it more difficult for our military to function. We have heard a letter from a lieutenant general in the Army about that. We heard from our own administration about that, about how it makes it more difficult. And we heard from our good friend from Texas about the Olympics award that the Democrats won today by spending more money in 1 hour than any Congress in the history of the Nation. And, again, it would be humorous if it weren't so serious, Mr. Speaker. It would be humorous if it weren't so serious.

And I am so pleased to be joined by a good friend from Florida, Congressman MICA, who has some interesting perspective on what went on here today on the floor of the House.

I appreciate your coming and bringing some accountability to what occurred today.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. PRICE, for yielding to me. Also, I want to thank you for the nights that you have spent on the floor during this session of Congress, the 110th, trying to bring the truth and also facts to the American people that are so important.

You said that I would talk tonight a little bit about my perspective, and I have an interesting family history. I have a brother who served as a Democratic Member of Congress from 1978 to 1988 here in the House of Representatives, Dan Mica; another brother, a Democrat, who served as an aid to Laughton Childs and to former Congressman Brademas. We are the first two Members and brothers to be from different political parties since 1889.

Almost everybody else is from the same party.

I say that because I truly am from a bipartisan family. When I came here some 14 years ago, we were in the minority, Mr. Speaker. And I served 2 years in the minority, and I want to tell you that I was treated very fairly by some of the Members of the majority. I will even cite Mr. ED TOWNS of New York, who took me in as a freshman new Member, gave me every opportunity to participate, recognized me. I was a full participant as a minority Member.

There were others who I will not name who did not allow me not to speak, who actually told me to be quiet, and who actually adjourned meetings, so I didn't have the opportunity to speak or participate. So I saw how bipartisanship and I saw how dictatorial rule works. And for some 12 years, the good Lord gave me the opportunity to be chairman of three subcommittees over 12 years. So I always employed the golden rule, the ED TOWNS rule, of treating everybody fairly.

I say that in context because today is January 31 and this month, the beginning of this Congress, is one of the saddest hours in the history of the Congress of the United States, at least that I am familiar with or that I have read about.

Now, we started here with the swearing in of NANCY PELOSI. I am an Italian American. I was proud of NANCY PELOSI's being the first Italian American and woman to take that position, and I think we were all very pleased for her on both sides of the aisle and congratulated her.

But then began, unfortunately, the saddest chapter in the history of Congress with the passage of six major pieces of legislation without the Congress even being organized, without the committees being organized, without one of those pieces of legislation going through the committee process.

What an incredible insult to the people of America who just finished an election. They elected us as representatives, 435. We, in turn, elected a new Speaker of the House, and the entire democratic process was obliterated. It has been the saddest month in the history of the United States Congress. Six major measures.

And the irony, I sat here in the week of celebrating and honoring Martin Luther King, one of the great civil rights leaders of our time, whose sole goal was to give rights to the minority that they had been denied. And the new majority completely obliterated in that week the rights of the minority. It was one of the saddest chapters I have seen. So all of their measures, all of them, are just floating out there. The other body hasn't taken them up. They were passed while trampling on the rights of the minority.

There are men and women fighting today, tonight, tomorrow for those rights to protect the minority. This is

not Bolivia. This is not Venezuela. This is not Cuba, where someone takes power and tramples on the rights of the minority. This is the United States of America, and every representative should have the opportunity to participate in that democratic process. Again, I am just offended.

And then the final offense today, the 31st, to pass the largest spending measure in the history of Congress in one sole bill without consultation, without participation, without the democratic process is the ultimate insult to the citizens of the United States, who expect a representative form of government, and to the Congress, to the rights of the minority.

□ 1800

This was a \$463 billion earmark. And we just got through an election in which the Republicans were chided for passing earmarks in the stealth of the night, for which the Democrats also were offenders. We paid a penalty. We lost the majority.

But you do not pass a bill of that size without the ability of even to participate in this bill, this \$463 billion earmark, the most costly in the history.

Now they think they pulled one over on everybody. But I guarantee you. I guarantee in that bill, since no one had a chance to see it or participate in it, they will find day after day embarrassing provisions that we did not have an opportunity to take out, to adjust, to correct.

So they will pay the price. When you do things in the stealth of the night, when you illegitimately conduct the process of Government, you will pay the penalty. We paid the penalty. They will pay the penalty. Marital law is not the way this Congress was intended to run.

This should be, in fact, bipartisan. Bipartisan means two working together. I am committed to that. I will continue to be committed to working that way. I come from, as I said, a bipartisan family; and we have got to work together.

So I hope today, January 31, 2007, a very sad day, ending of a sad chapter in the history, mark my words. This will go down in the history of this Congress as one of the darkest hours ever.

I thank you.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida. I appreciate so much his emotion and his passion and his perspective.

As you are living through these times, it is oftentimes difficult to get people to pay attention to what truly are historic occurrences, and I share with you that disappointment and sadness. I truly do.

Having served in a legislative body at the State level and seeing how bipartisanship can work and seeing how democracy truly is supposed to work, this has been a disappointing month. It has been a disappointing month, because most of what you can talk about in terms of getting your arms around

where the problem is is process. I talked about that at the beginning of this hour, Mr. Speaker, and I mention that the reason that process is so important is because that is what enables the minority to have participation. But not just the minority. It enables every single Member of this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, every single Member represents approximately the same number of people. We go to great pains to make certain that districts are basically of equal size every 10 years through the census process and through redistricting; and we do that because each individual in this body, each Member of this body, represents basically the same number of people and therefore should have essentially the same say in the process and in the deliberation.

Some folks have called this month the death of deliberation, and that truly has been. That is disappointing. That is very saddening for all of us whose constituents, whose American citizen constituents who go to the polls and vote, do indeed express their will to us.

If we are unable to express their will through this process here, then they are muted, they are silenced, they are disenfranchised; and that, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest is an unfair process, is a wrong process and is an undemocratic process. It doesn't have to be that way.

So I encourage my good friends on the other side of the aisle, and I know some of them are feeling pained by some of the decisions that their leadership has made over this past month, and I encourage them to continue to work for a process that will allow for the inclusion of all.

Because, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, we do not have Republican challenges or Democrat challenges, we have American challenges. The American people send us here to take care of those challenges and put forward the best solutions, and the best solutions come when all of us are involved in that process.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in a very positive way as we move forward and do what is best and what is right on behalf of the American people.

I want to thank my leadership once again for the opportunity to spend this hour on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to be here once again to continue the discussion of the 30-something Working Group. We want to thank Speaker

PELOSI for the honor to be on the House floor.

We actually had one of our newer Members, Mr. Speaker, make page 3. He is still a freshman, but he made significant advances. This is Jason Altmire, Mr. Speaker, from western Pennsylvania. His district abuts mine. His picture, name, pressing our leadership to make sure that we increase funding in the CR for veterans, to make sure that we did not accept any pay raise until the American people get their pay raise through the minimum wage. So we already have young leaders stepping up to bat contributing in their first term here.

I have got to say, Mr. Speaker, it has just been I actually think in many ways pathetic to listen to the debate here today over the continuing resolution. We all know the political situation over the past, you know, 14 years, Republican control in the Congress, and their inability in the last several years to govern at all. And they have locked out the Democrats for years and years and years.

Votes in the wee hours of the morning on the prescription drug benefit, on the energy bill, on budgets, which raided student aid money for students all across our country; and then, on top of all of that, they leave the new Democratic majority an absolute budget catastrophe for us to deal with.

Over the course of those 14 years, the Republican Congress and the Republican President borrowed more money, more money from foreign interests than all of the previous Presidents combined. So now we are going to get lectures from the Republican majority on how to run the budget process. Now we are going to get lectures from the most incompetent, ineffective Congress in the history of this institution, Mr. Speaker, the history of this institution.

This party will not be lectured about veterans' benefits, we will not be lectured to by the Republican minority about how to balance a budget, and we will not be lectured to about investments in this country.

You look at this CR and you look what we put in. We are not going to be lectured to by anybody. We made promises and accomplished more in the last few hundred hours of this Congress than that Republican majority has in the last 14 years. We implemented PAYGO so we will balance the budget.

We made some difficult decisions with the CR so we can move forward, and we are not going to be lectured to. Because we have made promises, and we have delivered.

Now just look at the first hundred hours, Mr. Speaker, just the first hundred hours. We cut student loan interest rates in half. Once fully implemented, it will save the average person taking out a loan almost \$5,000.

We raised the minimum wage. We allowed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate drug prices on behalf of the Medicare recipi-

ents. We repealed the corporate welfare to the energy companies that that majority, Republican majority put in place; and we are taking that money and investing it into alternative energy sources. We are doing things positive for the American people.

And we are going to inherit this budget, which we already have, that has borrowed more money from China, borrowed more money from Japan, borrowed money from OPEC countries, incapable of executing FEMA to address natural disasters and emergency situations in the United States. We know how to run Government.

When the Democrats passed the budget in 1993 with the Democratic President, created 20 million new jobs, we had surpluses as far as the eye can see. So we are cleaning up a mess here that we have inherited, and we are going to move forward and continue with our agenda, and we are proud.

We are going to move forward, and we have an agenda. We have moved on it. We promised it. We acted on it. And we are going to continue to move on it.

I will yield to our young, new rising star from western Pennsylvania, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I did want to talk for just a moment about how important it is that veterans were taken care of in this continuing resolution.

I do want to commend Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, and the rest of the Democratic leadership who did a great job of putting together what was a mess that was left to us.

As Mr. RYAN talked about, we had nine out of eleven appropriations bills to fund this Government that were left in our lap, and we had to deal with that, and we had some tough decisions to make. But under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI and Chairman OBEY we did what needed to be done.

I made clear to the leadership, and they agreed, that we needed to make sure that nobody should stand in front of our veterans when it comes time to pass funding resolutions. We have people fighting for us in the field overseas right now. We have veterans coming back from Iraq and, of course, veterans of every age.

That need does not go away. That need does not stop. As the Congressional Budget Office has indicated, the cost of caring for those veterans goes up year after year; and we have an obligation and a duty as Members of Congress to make sure that the VA health care budget goes up enough to maintain the current level of services for every veteran that walks through the door. I want to commend Chairman OBEY for taking care of that under this continuing resolution.

I also wanted to just take a walk down memory lane and let's take a look at what the Republican leadership did for veterans' health care over the past several years.

I have a chart here. It might be difficult for some to read.

January, 2003, the Bush administration cut veterans' health care for 164,000 veterans; and that is just the start.

March, 2003, 2 months later, the Republican budget that passed this Congress cut \$14 billion from veterans' health care.

March, 2004, 1 year later, the Republican budget shortchanged veterans' health care by an additional \$1½ billion.

March, 2005, the following year, President Bush's budget shortchanged veterans' health care by another \$2 billion and cut veterans' benefits by \$14 billion over 5 years. That is what we were left with.

Now, in the summer of 2005, after they had been warned when they passed that budget back in 2004 and after enormous pressure from the Democrats and from people around this country and especially from veterans' organizations, the Bush administration finally did acknowledge that they shortchanged the veterans; and they added back \$2.7 billion after months of Democratic pressure to put that money back in.

But then only a few months later, in March, 2006, President Bush's budget cut veterans' funding by an additional \$6 billion over 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, that is the mess that we were left with, this continuing resolution, and that was what needed to be resolved. And I said throughout my campaign and I say every weekend when I go back and speak to these veterans' groups that we are, as a Congress, going to make a new commitment to our veterans, a commitment that has not been there for the past 12 years; and we are going to put veterans' interests first when it comes time to deal with these funding resolutions.

So what did we do? In this continuing resolution that passed this House today, the Democrats increased the VA health care budget by \$3.6 billion. Now that is in an atmosphere of having left nine spending bills completely undone, and the Republican leadership made no effort to increase that funding. But we found the will, as Democrats, and we added \$3.6 billion to the veterans' budget.

That is leadership; and for that I commend Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY and the rest of the Democratic leaders who were involved in putting that together. That is what we have done here today.

So, at this point, I am going to yield to the gentleman from Ohio so he can continue to run the show.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield the remainder of the hour to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I need to step out. I will be back, but I would like to yield the rest of the hour to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

□ 1815

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for the balance of the majority leader's hour.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. ALTMIRE, I want to tell a little story because I am really pleased that you raised this issue, and that you have been the champion of ensuring that we don't, as we move through what is an unfortunate but necessary situation with this continuing resolution, I want to tell anyone listening a little story about an exchange that you and I had the other day on the House floor.

I have the privilege of serving as a Chief Deputy Whip for the House Democratic Caucus, and you are one of my assignments. We divide the House Democratic Caucus members up into groups, and you are included among the Members that I am typically engaged in lobbying. And when I approached you about whether you were going to be supportive of the continuing resolution that we voted on today, your immediate response, which was the right one, was, well, not if we are cutting money for veterans. And I was really proud that you did that and that you were absolutely not going to move forward on your support for the continuing resolution unless you were able to get the information that you needed to ensure that, in fact, not only were we not cutting funding for veterans but, we in fact, increased funding for veterans. And so the notation in your hometown paper was apt and appropriate, and I commend you for your advocacy because that is what this is all about.

The new direction that the American people demanded, that they chose on November 7 included selecting people like you to send to Washington to make sure that when there was no one standing up, we certainly were all standing up united as a minority; but that there were not enough people in this body standing up for veterans. On the contrary, as you just outlined through the charts in a chronological way, the Republicans and the Republican administration were doing the opposite, were actually making it more difficult for veterans to get the services that they need and that they were entitled to and that they deserved through their patriotism and devotion to this country. So I commend you on that.

We were in a situation in adopting the continuing resolution today that was the result of the mess, as you said, that the Republicans handed us. I mean, how irresponsible to just not complete nine of the 11 appropriations bills. I sit on the House Appropriations Committee now. I am just at the beginning of that process, but it is mind boggling to me, how, really, I mean, the Constitution says the only thing we have to do, the only thing Congress has to do is pass the budget. And they didn't do it. They didn't do it because it is hard. It is difficult. You have to make tough decisions. And you know,

right up in front of an election, where they were struggling as it was, they didn't want to make those difficult decisions. And we have a lot of our Members, some in tough districts that are going to have to go home and have to answer some difficult questions, because obviously, you know, we didn't like everything that we had to do. But if we didn't go forward and try to get to the 2008 budgetary process and make sure we could do right by the people in this country, then we would have been in an even worse mess.

So kudos to you for standing up for veterans and for adding another voice on their behalf where there wasn't one before.

And if the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) wanted to jump in I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Well, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for yielding.

One of the things I realized when I came down here in January was that you get a lot of analogies, and some of them work, some of them don't. But listening to our colleagues criticize the budget, the continuing resolution we just passed here, you kind of think of the old "bull in the china shop" analogy.

This is kind of like the bull walking into the china shop spending a good half an hour breaking everything in the china shop; the owner finally having the good sense to kick him out, and then him showing up about 2 days later and asking why everything hasn't been fixed yet. I mean, that is essentially, what has happened here is that there has been so much damage, Mr. Speaker, done to this budget by virtue of nine of the 11, nine of the 11 appropriations bills not being completed by the end of business.

And an important thing to note is that, you know, Congress was back here in the holiday season in November and December trying to finish those budget bills. And I am just learning, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, about the budget process, but from what I know, November, December is pretty late to be even working on those budget bills. Those budget bills were supposed to be done over the summer and fall. And so even giving themselves an extra 4 or 5 months to complete those bills, they still weren't done on time.

And so when the Democrats finally were put back in charge of this place by virtue of the millions of Americans who stood up across this country to start putting common sense middle class values first, the people who put Mr. ALTMIRE and myself here in Congress, when they finally, we finally sort of reentered the china shop and realized that everything had been broken, we realized it was going to take a little while to clean everything up. And what we did today, this continuing resolution which keeps this government running for the next several months, is an important first step because there are some critical programs, veterans

benefits at the top of that list, Mr. ALTMIRE, that are funded here.

What else are we talking about? We are talking about Pell grants. Even after coming before this body and, with remarkable bipartisan support, decreasing the rate of student loans for millions of students across this country, we came back in this budget, we increased the maximum Pell grant by \$260, to over \$4,000, \$4,300 for the average student.

We put in new money or in schools that are failing to meet the Head Start standards. Mr. ALTMIRE, you know that both of us heard so much about that from our school districts over the course of the campaign and over the course of the last month. Now, 6,700 schools across this country that are failing to meet those No Child Left Behind standards are going to get new funding from this government in order to keep on operating.

We increased community health center funding by \$207 million. Community health centers in this very broken health care system are sometimes the place of last resort, often the place of only resort for so many uninsured families. We are now going to make sure that they get the funding that they deserve.

So in so many ways we started to clean up the mess that that bull made for the last 12 years. We are starting to put the china back together. We are starting to buy a little bit of new stuff to put on the shelves. And it is going to take a little while. It is going to take a little while.

But it is important to remember that the work we did here today, I think, is just a beginning on that front, Mr. ALTMIRE. And I join Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. RYAN in commending you for standing up for the veterans in your district, because when you speak for those veterans, it is not just in your district, it is for all the veterans in my district and, as an extension, it is for all the future veterans, because as you know, we are so lucky to have an all volunteer military.

But if they think that by going into the service they will return home and find a country and a Nation that does not honor their service, well, then we are going to have a lot harder time than we are already having finding people to fight the future battles and wars that this country may engage in.

I would yield. I see Mr. MEEK has joined us. But I would yield to Mr. ALTMIRE and thank him again for his advocacy over the past several weeks.

Mr. ALTMIRE. And I did want to follow up on what the gentlelady from Florida had talked about earlier, what was left to us, and the reason that it was left to us. This was a politically, cowardly maneuver, calculated to gamble on the outcome of the elections. They left nine spending bills unfinished, hoping that they would then win and come back for a lame duck session where they could ram through further spending increases and increase the

Federal budget deficit even more, as they have done every year for the past 6 years. Instead, the results of the election were not to their liking.

The Democrats are retaking control of Congress at that point, and they made a calculated decision. Instead of finishing the work that their constituents sent them here to do, they, instead, dropped the ball and left all nine spending bills until the new year and the new Congress, and countless programs languishing, twisting in the wind while the new change in Congress came.

And again, under the leadership of the new Democrats who have taken control of Congress, we were able to pass, within a month, nine appropriation bills that they couldn't pass over the course of an entire year.

So I can't say enough about the work that this House has done and that this Congress has done in putting together a package that was very, very difficult to do, and it is just a great accomplishment.

Mr. MEEK has joined us. I would ask, does the gentleman wish to comment on this?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am listening.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. ALTMIRE, let me just jump in while the gentleman from Florida is listening, because one of the things I think it is important to point out is when we talk in the language of government, it is difficult for regular folks to understand what we are saying. So we are talking about the CR, the continuing resolution, the terminology that we deal with on a daily basis. But that is not what sort of every day folks understand.

And the continuing resolution, it is important to point out, is the budget, the Federal budget that keeps the lights on. And people will recall a number of years ago when the Republican Congress decided that, in retaliation for who knows what, because they couldn't get the Clinton administration to agree to what they wanted, because they thought that brinksmanship was the most appropriate strategy, they shut the government down. People were furloughed. Government programs that were vitally important to different constituencies around the country came to a halt.

What we have done is, and Chairman OBEY has been the champion of this. What we have done is, not only have we made sure that that doesn't happen, because brinksmanship and engaging in irresponsible actions like that make no sense, we have made some difficult decisions. But we haven't made irrational decisions that would be harmful to people.

For example, we could have passed a continuing resolution that simply adopted the 2006 spending levels, the same spending levels that we had in 2006 and just moved forward. But that would have resulted, as you pointed out for veterans, in some cuts. And in

our discussion on the floor the other day, you pointed out that unless there were increases, essentially, because of inflation, because of the adjustments in cost of living that are necessary, and because there are simply more people, more service men and women who are in need, we would not have had the money we needed to meet the needs of veterans.

But beyond that, let me just talk about what, because our good friends on the other side of the aisle are, of course, being critical that we didn't just pass a straight continuing resolution. Let's talk about what that would have done. Essentially, that would have jeopardized our national security. If we did that, if we simply passed the same level budget that we adopted in 2006, that would have resulted in thousands of layoffs, cuts for health care workers, cuts for members of the Armed Forces, cuts for veterans.

For example, the Food Safety and Inspection Service would face a month of furloughs. Can you imagine a month of furloughs in the Food Safety and Inspection Service? That means that we could end up with rotting meat in supermarkets and people potentially buying them. Or let's not use language that is too strong. Questionable meat. I mean, if we don't make sure that we have our food inspected, then we are going to jeopardize people's health. That would have also resulted in the closure of 6,000 meat processing plants that could not have been inspected.

The Federal Judiciary would have had to fire 2,500 workers. The Small Business Administration, and Mr. MEEK, this is incredibly important to our area because how often we face natural disasters through hurricanes. But the Small Business Administration's disaster loan assistance program, which provides back up for FEMA's individual assistance program, that would have been run dry by the end of February.

Now, given how many people are still suffering from the aftermath of Katrina and Rita and Wilma and the other hurricanes and the other natural disasters that have hit around this country, I just cannot imagine what the consequences would have been. Actually, I can imagine what the consequences would have been for millions of Americans.

So we struck a balance here. We were being fiscally responsible, but at the same time, not hanging Americans out to dry without regard for their well-being. And that is what the Democratic Caucus's approach always is. You have to think about the fact that all of the decisions that we make here, Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. MURPHY and Mr. MEEK, affect real people.

I have often thought over the time I have served in the Congress and in the State Legislature in Florida, in Florida, and I am not sure how far your State capital is in Connecticut from your home, Mr. MURPHY, but Tallahassee is 450 miles from where I live. And

I served in the State Legislature for 12 years. Mr. MEEK, I think, served in the State Legislature for 10, between the House and the Senate. It is so easy, I mean, we are obviously even further away from our homes, I certainly am. But you are pretty far from your homes, too, making decisions in Washington. And it could be argued that it would be so easy to make decisions in a vacuum here. The people we affect, whose decisions that we make, who we affect, they can't come in this Chamber. They are not in the room with us. The folks in the gallery are that are watching, but it would be so easy to just forget that every decision, every vote, every time we put our card in that slot and our name lights up on the board "yea" or "nay," the decision we make affects a human being.

□ 1830

But you become desensitized to it. There is a danger that you could become desensitized to it. Certainly the Republican side of the aisle became desensitized to it. For years and years, they didn't think about the results, they didn't think about the consequences. Well, that is the balance the Democrats strike. Pragmatism with a healthy dose of thoughtfulness and compassion. That is what it is all about.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Would the gentlewoman yield for a moment? And I think she is exactly right, and I think that that disconnect that you talk about, that certainly was in existence here for a very long time was one of the reasons why we now have a Democratic majority. The people last summer were fueling up their cars at \$3.50 a gallons. We are finding that all of a sudden, they were having to pay \$50 co-pays rather than \$25 co-pays. And they looked at a Congress which seemed pretty incredulous to their concerns, that seemed to watch without listening. And you are right, people get hurt by the decisions they make down here. And I will give you an example.

In my district I have a senior housing complex in Torrington, major place where a lot of seniors live in one of the biggest cities in my district, and we have had some security problems there, some people coming in off the streets and had a couple violent incidents. Well, most of the facility and the staff there are financed through Federal grants. Well, because this Congress, over the last 12 years, slashed Federal housing funds to the bone, they have had to make major layoffs at that housing complex.

In fact, it finally came down to a very difficult but unfortunately necessary decision that that housing facility made to lay off their security guards. That is going to put hundreds of senior citizens at risk in this senior housing complex. And they come to their local elected officials, their State-elected officials and ask, what can you do to help? And everybody points back to where the problem came

from. It was years of neglect down here in Washington of housing programs, just as there were years of neglect years to health care programs, years of neglect to defense and certain national security programs.

And in order to reestablish that commitment to the seniors of Torrington, to those veterans in Pennsylvania, it is going to take a little while.

But if you are back in your communities, if you are talking to people, regular middle-class, working folks people, you will hear those stories on how the votes we take here affect people back in Connecticut, back in Florida, back in Pennsylvania. And for some reason, whether it was the power that went to people's head, whether it was the pomp and circumstance that surrounds being a Member of Congress, for some reason, over the last 12 years, and in particular, I think, Mr. ALTMIRE, over the past 4, 5, or 6 years, there was a wall that was put up around Washington, D.C., and folks that were controlling the committees here and the budget here just were not listening to people back in State of Connecticut, State of Pennsylvania, Florida, and throughout this country, because if they did, they would know we have to put more money in housing.

If they listened to those veterans that you and I talk to every day at people's doors, they would know that men and women who came back from Iraq, came back from Vietnam, World War II veterans are struggling. And what we are now doing here in starting to clean up that mess is also to start listening again. And I believe Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ is very correct on that notion.

I yield to Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank you so very much. You know, I don't put a lot of value in folks coming down to the floor sharing inaccurate information. And it is very unfortunate, because one thing that I can say here of the 30-something Working Group, we actually meet off the floor and we make sure, Mr. Speaker, that information that we are sharing is factual, that it is factual and that if someone wants to challenge us on that particular fact, they can go to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they can go to the Library of Congress, what have you. It is there. Or they can go to a piece of legislation.

To come down and make statements that could mislead Members of Congress or could mislead the American public, I think that it is very unfortunate and it is something that should be frowned upon. But I guess the only good reason why I can come up with the reason why some Members on the minority side will come to the floor and make some inaccurate statements of the essence of the continuing resolution today, I go back to what I have been talking about for the last 2 weeks and that is the bipartisanship that has been taking place here on this floor.

If I was a part of the Republican leadership, I would be concerned, too. I

would wonder how would the American people think, I mean, what would they think, Democrat or Republican, on how Democrats can be in control of the House and then, at the same time, have this bipartisanship taking place with Democrats in control. Let me just clarify what I am saying.

Time after time, Republicans are voting with Democrats on good measures. Today, this continuing resolution was a good piece of legislation. It wasn't a partisan vote. It shouldn't have been a partisan vote. Two hundred twenty-nine Democrats voted for the continuing resolution; 57 Republicans voted for the continuing resolution. We should all be on the floor happy that we can come together on a piece of legislation that is so important to the country. What is the alternative? The government shutting down? We don't want that.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I have a question. Does the gentleman know off the top of his head, with the major legislation that we passed in the 100 hours and what we have done subsequent to that, including the continuing resolution, approximately how many Republicans we have seen cross the aisle and join us in a bipartisan manner?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I don't have my notes right here. If you have it handy, go ahead and answer the question.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, I do know that we got an average of 62 Republicans to vote with the Democrats on the Six-in-'06 agenda on making sure that the Federal Government can negotiate for lower prices for the Medicare part D prescription drug plan; making sure that we fully implement the 9/11 Commission Report; making sure that we repeal the subsidies to the oil industry; making sure that we do the job that the people sent us here to do and that they spoke so strongly about through their vote on November 7. An average of 62 Republicans voted with us on each of those items.

Mr. ALTMIRE. And then today 57 more, as the gentleman said. I didn't mean to put the gentleman on the spot, but I wanted to just reemphasize the point that he was making that this is not a partisan majority ramming it down the throat of the Republicans. This is working in a bipartisan spirit, something that has not been seen in this Congress for more than 12 years. And here we are, the end of our first month in office, we passed another major piece of legislation joined by 57 Members on the other side. And the gentleman is right that this is something that we should be applauding. And this is new to Congress. This is not something that has happened recently.

So I would hate for people on the other side during the debate to characterize this as a partisan bill and a partisan effort. It is not. We again, with an average of 62 Republicans, 57 again

today, have done this in a bipartisan way, crafting it so that all sides can support it, because we all agree that we need to do things that are to the betterment of the American people and to the benefit of the American people.

I would yield again to the gentleman from Florida to continue, but I did want to just reemphasize that point.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It is no problem at all. Clarification is very, very important in this process. And the Republican leadership seems to continue to have a problem with the bipartisan spirit that is in the Chamber now, because in the last Congress that wasn't the case; in the Congress before that, that wasn't the case. There were partisan votes every day. I mean, it was almost like, how can we send a bill to the floor to make the Democrats vote against the bill versus for the bill? And one of the things that the American people want is for us to work together. We are all Americans. We salute one flag. We walk into this Chamber, we all carry one voting card. And I think that is important.

But to the point, to show the difference between us and others that may come to the floor sharing this information off the cuff, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ is 110 percent right and accurate as it relates to the percentage, but she named off a piece of legislation that Republicans and Democrats voted for: 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act, 68 Republicans voted for it, 231 Democrats voted for it, which was 299 total for us to pass it. The Fair Minimum Wage, 82 Republicans voted for it, 233 Democrats voted for it, and brought the vote to 315. We looked at the issue of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act; 37 Republicans, 216 Democrats brought that vote to 253, which was in the affirmative. The Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiating Act, 24 Republicans, 231 Democrats, 255, to make it an affirmative vote. And the College Student Relief Act, 124 Republicans, 232 Democrats, that brought that vote to 356.

These are major, major, major issues that are facing the country, issues that have been clogged up in the Republican Congress, 109th, 108th, 107th, 105th Congress. And now the American people said they wanted to move in a new direction and we are moving in that direction. And, unfortunately, there are some Members of Congress on the Republican side of the aisle that have a problem with that.

I told you that I am all excited, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ can tell you, Mr. RYAN can tell you: Lead us the opportunity to lead and we will lead.

Mr. RYAN how, many times: If you give us the opportunity to be in the leadership of the House of Representatives you will be served? West Coast.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Put me in, Coach. Mr. MEEK of Florida. Put me in, Coach. The Heartland of America, East Coast, Republican, Democrat, Independent, Green Party, thinking about

voting, now voting. You do it, we will make it happen, and it is happening.

So you have some that come to the floor and talk about, well, you know, this is not happening and I voted against it because I didn't get 2 hours to speak independently on the floor against it, and that is the reason why I voted against it.

I just want to lay it out because I want to make sure that the Members know and the American people know that it is just Washington rhetoric. We are here making it happen. We are happening.

I yield to my good friend.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, I appreciate my good from Miami, Florida yielding to me.

The funny part watching the debate today was that the other side, because they had the opportunity for so long to pass so many of these pieces of legislation and to get them through the Senate and get them signed by the President and they didn't take advantage of it, that they have very little credibility in dealing with the issue of the fact that we are actually doing this stuff.

And so I agree with my friend Mr. MEEK; it has been exciting. This is great. This is good stuff. You guys are reading the increases and the different programs. And, as Mr. OBEY said, this is a thinking man's document.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You know, just the way you are going back and forth on the Republican's response to the process, you know, it is just really, gosh, I can't say what comes to mind. It is galling. It really is galling that they do have nerve to talk about process.

Because just in my 2 years of experience, and certainly two wrongs don't make a wrong, but there is no second wrong here. I mean, in my experience in the last 2 years, and Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, you have had more experience and more lengthy experience than I and Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. MURPHY have had, but I recall votes being held open for 40 minutes to several hours to twist enough arms to get the votes. We, of course, haven't had to do that because not only do we get all of our Members to vote for our legislation, but we get a good chunk if not, and in one case, a majority of theirs.

I remember being shut out, completely shut out on every major question over the last 2 years, no amendments allowed, no commentary except in a token way. And now they are whining about process?

You know, the small point I wanted to make, and Mr. ALTMIRE, you are a dad, you have young kids; I am a mom, I have young kids; Mr. MEEK has young kids, and some day Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN, I am sure you will have young kids too.

But you know, when your kids whine at you and complain about something that you know is just their immaturity, their wishing something could be the case, but when they get a little

older they will realize that they were wrong? That is what this is.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What is it? You are saying, what is it? Just tell us.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is nerve is what it is. It is just pure unadulterated nerve. The American people see through this. They don't have any substance to talk about. They can only whine about process.

□ 1845

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The interesting part here is the CR that we passed today was to clean up their mess that they left. They only passed one out of 13 appropriations bills.

So you can only imagine, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden they leave all of this mess for us to deal with and we try to deal with their mess and they want input. Well, you had your chance. You had 14 years and all kinds of months last year to pass this stuff, and you didn't do it.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I think they should have their say. I really do. Going forward, when we hear legislation and get into the regular order, we have markups in committee hearings and legislation that Members file, we will do that. But we are still cleaning up their mess.

The Six in '06 agenda is an agenda of the major issues that the American people voted for us to come here and do that we offered as amendments.

We offered the minimum wage, we offered fully implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, and through all of the other procedural attempts we made within the confines of their limiting us, we offered repealing the subsidies to the oil industry.

We offered legislation and amendments that would have the student loan interest rate and make higher education access more affordable. And they said no. They said no, no, no, over and over and over again.

Sorry, now it is our turn. It is time to implement the agenda that the American people asked us to. It is time to clean up their mess.

Mr. RYAN, going forward, I am all for what Speaker PELOSI has said that we will do, which is give them the most bipartisan House of Representatives that history has ever seen. But the mess has to be cleaned up before we can do that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You and Mr. RYAN are members of the powerful Appropriations Committee; and, today, watching Mr. OBEY, the chairman, and seeing what he was able to do in moving this continuing resolution, which is the appropriations act which funds the government, to see that happen and to understand the history of it. Because when the Republicans took over in 1995 or 1994, went into power in 1995, they didn't have to deal with a continuing resolution because Mr. OBEY and the Appropriations Committee passed all of their bills on time. They didn't leave unfinished business for the Republican Congress.

And, guess what, they also had a surplus as far as the eye could see. So whatever idea we wanted to implement, we had the money to do it because we had managers in this House of Representatives under Democratic leadership to make sure that the country was in the black and in good standing and did not have bad credit and did not owe foreign nations \$1.05 trillion.

Then the Republican leadership comes in here and they hand things out, special projects, bridges to nowhere, all of these big items, and then come to the floor and grab it. That's fine.

The reason I am happy today is today is the beginning of getting the Appropriations Committee and this House in order and getting us on track under regular order. And I will guarantee as sure as my name is Kendrick Meek that the 2008 appropriations act will pass on time. There will be hearings. We will look at every project and make sure that everything is in order, because American taxpayer dollars are going towards those projects.

Very few appropriations committees met. They hardly met. Why do you want to ask questions and have hearings? As I said, the Foreign Affairs Committee only had one hearing on Iraq. They have had five thus far in this Congress, and counting.

So I feel very confident about the fact that we are talking about our vision and the leadership; B, we are pointing out the difference between some of the Members on the minority side that want to continue to carry out the old way and the Members on the minority side that want to move in a new direction. I am glad that they are there.

My last point, we have five Members in the majority here on a Wednesday afternoon when we are going to recess for the week that has the will and the desire. We have the will and desire to continue to let the American people and the Members know that we want to lead and we want to lead this country in a new direction and we want to work in a bipartisan way.

We could be home. We could be somewhere else. My kids are back in the cloakroom right now. I could be having dinner with them. But this is important. I want them to know, and when historians look at what was happening during a time when we had two wars going on, we have a President wanting to escalate with troops and the American people saying we don't want it, we have the country in a deficit, and then we have Members here crying about a project was cut out of the bill and I am upset about it.

I am glad, ladies and gentlemen, that we are here on this floor, and I am glad that we are representing on behalf of the American people. We are not the Democratic National Committee. We are Members of Congress. And it should not be the Republican National Committee, it should be Members of Congress. That is what makes this House

work, and that is the reason why it worked today on the continuing resolution.

I am very happy that we did pass this continuing resolution. I am so glad that 57 Republicans joined Democrats in passing this continuing resolution, because it is showing that we are actually moving in a new direction, not just Democrats are moving in a new direction, but the U.S. House of Representatives is.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you, Mr. MEEK, on behalf of my constituents and the people throughout this country for the vigilance that you and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. RYAN showed for the last 2 years, and in your case longer than that. There were a lot of things you could be doing late at night when Mr. ALTMIRE and I might have caught you on TV into the wee hours. But you were out here spreading the message that it was time for working class, regular folks throughout this country to have their day here again. There had been enough time for the special interests and lobbyists and everyone else to have their day in Congress. It was time for regular people to have their day in the people's House.

I want to add something. We use this term "Republican leadership," and I think that is important. Because one of the things that you have figured out over the last couple of weeks is that there is a difference between the Republican leadership and a lot of the rest of the folks in the Republican Party.

Maybe I should be careful to not give too much credit to the other side. But it seems like on every measure the Republican leadership trots out and says, the Republicans are going to be against raising the minimum wage, and they turn around to see who is following. And, guess what, they vote for it.

The Republican leadership says, we are going to be against cutting the student loan interest rates. They run out here and turn around to see who is following them, and there are even more of their colleagues voting with the Democrats.

They say, this process is broken, we are going to vote against this continuing resolution, and they turn around, and there are 50-some-odd of their Members supporting it.

Why? Because, on average, we had 60-some-odd votes for every piece of the 100 hours agenda from the Republican side and 50-plus votes for the continuing resolution.

Why do you have so many Republican votes? Because there are Republicans, just as there are Democrats, who are in touch with their constituents. When they go home for weekends, they hear about the struggles that middle-class families are going through to pay for health care and education.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to interject on that point.

Because the funny thing, ironically funny, about what you are talking

about, where we have an average of 62 Republicans supporting the Six in '06 agenda and 57 supporting the continuing resolutions appropriations bill today, the last 2 years, our experience, Mr. RYAN's, Mr. MEEK's and my experience, is watching the Republican leadership wrench our colleagues's arms behind their back; and, in many cases, new Members replaced those Members. Those Members caved. Those Members either didn't vote their conscience.

We used to talk about, in the 30-something hour, about how it seemed they checked their consciences and their beliefs and their constituents' beliefs at the door. They would come here and allow themselves to be influenced by their leadership and vote differently in some cases than they publicly said they would vote.

I think that actually happened with your predecessor, Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. That's right. I think what happened here for the last 12 years, the agenda on the House floor was a Republican agenda. Republicans supported it, and they twisted some Republican arms to support it.

The agenda that is now before the House of Representatives is a people's agenda. That is why you see Republicans and Democrats supporting it. Because the agenda doesn't have to do with somebody on the seventh floor of the Republican National Committee or somebody on the third floor of the Democratic National Committee. The agenda has to do with the people that we meet at the diner and the senior housing center.

That is why I think for the next 2 years, I know for the next 2 years, we are going to see Republicans and Democrats coming together. Because this isn't a party agenda anymore. This is a people's agenda. That may sound corny, but it is probably the best way to articulate what is happening here.

As a new Member, it fills me with joy and pride to be part of this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Two things that we did not mention that were also part of the Six in '06 agenda were ethics reform and the PAYGO rules. Mr. ALTMIRE, I know you have been a supporter of both of those things.

We had a culture of corruption hanging over this institution and over this Capitol, and we were able to adopt some ethics rules that make sure that we can restore the American people's confidence in their government again. That is what our freshman class on the Democratic side ran on. One of the issues that they ran on was making sure that they could inspire their constituents to believe in what we are doing here again.

Mr. ALTMIRE. You are right. Those are the two things that we did the very first couple of days, right after we swore in that new class of freshmen and Democrats took control of Congress. We did away with the gifts and travel and the golf outings and the

meals that had been so pervasive in Congress over the past several years.

More importantly to what we are talking about tonight, we reinstituted the PAYGO budget scoring system. And for those Members who talk to their constituents at home, it is what they do in their home kitchens at the end of month. It is what we do when we have to balance our own budgets. You have to have money on one side of the ledger to pay for what goes out on the other side. It is a very simple concept.

Unfortunately, this Congress right after this President took office decided to let that expire. That was required in Congresses past. But, unfortunately, this administration had other ideas; and so they ran up mountains of debt because they were no longer required to have money on the other side of the ledger when they wanted to continue their free-spending ways.

The result was when President Bush first took office he inherited 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses that were forecast to continue as far as the eye could see. In fact, the 10-year budget projection was \$5.3 trillion, trillion, with a "T," in surplus over the 10-year period from 2001 to 2010.

Well, what has happened since then? They allowed pay-as-you-go to expire. They have run up the deficit, \$3.5 trillion of debt over the past 6 years. The President next week is going to submit to us his budget for fiscal year 2008. It is going to be his seventh consecutive out-of-balance budget. Those deficits continue as far as the eye can see.

What we did in the first week when Democrats took control of Congress, we said, enough is enough. This must stop. We instituted the PAYGO scoring system, which is what turned the record deficits of the 1980s into the record surpluses that we had in the 1990s.

Now that led us to have to make some very difficult decisions in the continuing resolution that we passed today, but we have done it. We have done the hard work. We have talked about the increases that were included in the bill and the funding for veterans and for Pell Grants and for the new expanded health centers that are going to serve 1.2 million patients around the country.

But I do want to make clear to everybody that this measure also includes more than 60 different program cuts to help pay for that, to help balance that situation.

□ 1900

So those 60 programs were reduced below fiscal year 2006 funding proposals, and that provided the \$10 billion in savings that we needed to offset those increases that we made in veterans health care and the other programs that we talked about.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I find it very interesting as the debate progressed today to hear all the conservatives who have been saying government's too big and then they blew the budget completely out of balance, borrowed money

from China and they are here complaining about all this government is bad stuff, well, you are cutting this program and that program. That is why I think they have lost a lot of credibility with the American people, Mr. Speaker, is because there is no consistency with their argument.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Consistency.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No consistency. What they said last year, they did not do this year. What they did last year, they do not want us to do. There is no consistency to their argument at all. Consistency is the word for today, the lack thereof on the Republican side.

As we close, because I know we just have a few minutes left, and I want to yield back to my friend from Florida, I think it is very interesting what we are seeing happening already. We talked a lot in the last couple of years about oversight and that when the Democrats were in charge, Mr. Speaker, we were going to provide oversight.

Now, we start seeing things open up in Iraq, with all these contracts, from all these big corporations who were getting all these big government contracts, all of the sudden you are starting to see come out of these committee hearings exactly what has been going on. Now you are starting to see maybe the administration was strong arming some scientists to spin global climate change data. You are starting to see this all percolate up.

I think one of the other things we said we are going to do is execute our constitutional obligation to provide oversight, and we are seeing that, and we are seeing the results of that with the global warming, with the war in Iraq, things happening, that didn't happen in Katrina, all starting to rise up.

I want to thank the gentleman from the Pittsburgh area and the gentleman from Connecticut, my two favorite people from Florida. I want to thank you and I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her closing remarks.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I think your comments are a good segue to where we should close which is that the Congress has now finally reasserted our constitutional role to be a check, a check and a balance over the other branches of government, particularly over the executive branch in which that authority and oversight was completely ceded over the last 12 years.

I sit on the House Judiciary Committee. We had an oversight committee today on the presidential signing statement where the President, this President in particular more than any other President combined, has issued signing statements, his opinion and his interpretation of legislation which is really the judicial branch's responsibility, that he would just choose not to implement or implement in the way that he wanted to, a particular section of law, wholly inappropriate.

Congress is back in our appropriate role, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to talk about our Web site, but first to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I just want to warn the gentleman from Pennsylvania that you need to say both the e-mail address and the Web site or you will be scolded by some of the more veteran Members of the 30 Something Group. So I want to give you that piece of advice as you close.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Connecticut alerting me to that.

For the Members who would like to tell the constituents how they can learn something more about the 30 Something Working Group, I would encourage them to e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov or they can visit the Web site at www.speaker.gov/30something.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the 30 Something Working Group appreciates the hour granted to us by Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. STENY H. HOYER AND HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH FEBRUARY 5, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 31, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STENY H. HOYER and the Honorable CHRIS VAN HOLLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 5, 2007.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is a question that often comes to my mind. I wonder to how many Americans this comes to their mind.

We are a great superpower, the undisputed economic and military superpower of this world. Have you ever asked yourself why? What is so special about us that we have this privileged position in the world?

We no longer have the most oil in the world or gold or silver or diamonds. We no longer have the best work ethic in the world. We no longer have the most respect for technical education. We no longer have the most respect for the nuclear family. Nearly half of our children are born out of wedlock. What makes us so special?

I have asked myself that question a lot of times, and I think there are two

reasons. There may be others, but I have noted for myself two reasons I think. One of those is the enormous respect that this country, that this government, has for our civil liberties. There is no other Constitution, there is no other government, that has this great respect for civil liberties.

The Constitution written in 1787 was hardly dry before our Founding Fathers wondered if it was clear that most of the rights, most of the power, should belong to the people, and so they wrote what we call the Bill of Rights, those first 10 amendments which delineated very clearly that most of the rights belonged to the people.

Civil liberties are always a casualty of war. Abraham Lincoln, my favorite President, violated our civil liberties in the civil war. In World War II, we interned the Japanese Americans. I served here with Norm Mineta, former Secretary of Transportation. Japanese Americans. He told me, "ROSCOE, as a little boy, I remember holding my parents' hands when they ushered us into that concentration camp in Idaho."

Those wars were ended and we got back the habeas corpus that was denied during the civil war, and the Japanese Americans were released from those interment camps.

We are now engaged in a great war, a war like no other that we have ever fought. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that in our zeal to catch terrorists that we may threaten the civil liberties that I think are largely responsible for making us this great, free Nation.

I think these civil liberties have established a climate and milieu in which creativity and entrepreneurship can flourish, and I think we put at risk who we are in our superior position in the world if we put at risk these civil liberties. We need to be very careful, and actions like the PATRIOT Act, warrantless wiretaps, detention without either charging or giving counsel to the accused, we must be very careful, Mr. Speaker, that we do not put at risk those things that have made us such a great Nation. But this is a subject for another day.

A second reason, which is the subject for today that I believe that we are such a great, free Nation, undisputed superpower in the world, I believe that our Founding Fathers understood that God sat with them at the table when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I have here in the front of the little Constitution that I carry a statement from Alexander Hamilton one year before they wrote the Declaration of Independence, and I think that it kind of epitomizes the belief that most of our Founding Fathers had.

The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hands of the divinity itself and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.

Is there any better evidence that our Founding Fathers believed that God sat with them at the table when they wrote these great documents?

I would like to read something from the Declaration of Independence, that first document, in 1776. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

Five times in the Declaration of Independence God is mentioned. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that our courts may declare the Declaration of Independence unconstitutional because it mentions God?

As I mentioned earlier, the Constitution, which was the fulfillment of the promise made in the Declaration of Independence, written, by the way, 11 years later in 1787, this Constitution sought to assure the permanence of these God-given rights noted in the Declaration of Independence to the citizens of this new country. They did that by delineating a very limited Federal Government. If the Federal Government is limited, obviously the powers, the rights that it does not have belong to the people, but the ink was hardly dry on this document before they wondered was it really clear, would people really understand from this Constitution.

It is certainly implicit there in the fact that our Federal Government is given very few powers. You would need never believe they meant that today, Mr. Speaker, by the size of our Federal Government. We really need to take a look at that because we are doing a lot of things that I think that if our Founding Fathers were resurrected would be quite surprised that we thought their Constitution permitted the Federal Government to do.

They were concerned that maybe it was not clear that these precious rights given to us by God were to be secured to the people and not to the government, and so they started 10 amendments through the process of two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate and three-fourths of the State legislatures, and 10 of them made it through, and we know them as the Bill of Rights.

The rights of the people are so frequently mentioned in these Bill of Rights, which is why we call them the Bill of Rights. The first amendment, the right of the people peaceably to assemble. The second amendment, the right of the people to keep and bear arms. The third amendment does not mention rights, but it certainly delineates the right of the people not to have the military quartered in their houses except in time of war. The fourth amendment begins with the words the right of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that this does not say the rights of the citizens. It says the rights of the people, and our Founding Fathers did dif-

ferentiate in this great Constitution between people and citizens because when they are delineating the requirements for the presidency or other offices they note the requirement for citizenship.

The fifth amendment, which delineates a lot of rights, begins with the delineation of a right which is frequently denied to us by our governments, both local, State and Federal. I think it is the most violated part of our Constitution. The last part of the fifth amendment, a lot of rights in there, the right of the people not to have to testify against themselves, the right of the people not to have to stand trial twice for the same offense, but this last right, little noted, violated every day by all levels of government, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

□ 1915

We need to take a serious look at that. If we can start denying one right of the people in this great Constitution, arguing that times have changed, are not all of these rights at risk?

The sixth amendment, enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial; the seventh amendment, the right by trial; and then the eighth amendment, the people have the right not to have excessive fines or cruel and unusual punishment.

The ninth amendment, the lost amendment, the amendment that almost nobody reads, the amendment that I think very few people understand, it is a very simple one. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

This is written in old English and legalese. What does it mean? What it means is that just because a right is not given to the people specifically in the Constitution, don't disparage that right to the people, to whom that right belongs.

Fundamentally, all rights belong to the people. They choose, they choose to give certain power, certain rights to their government.

Because when there are a lot of people who need government, the government must have some rights. Our Founding Fathers wanted our government to have little power and few rights.

The tenth amendment, the power is not delegated. They might just as well have said, rights not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by the States or reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

If you were writing this in everyday English, and not using legalese, you would say, if you cannot find it in article 1, section 8, the Federal Government cannot do it.

There is a whole lot of what we do that I can't find in article 1, section 8. I would submit that we have amended our Constitution 27 times. If we think

it is outdated, we ought to be doing something that this Constitution prohibits us from doing, then, sir, we need to amend the Constitution. We don't need to ignore it.

Essential to our understanding of our origins is an understanding of what our government really is. I am afraid, sir, that too few understand this.

When Benjamin Franklin came out of the Constitutional Convention in 1797, as the story goes, he was asked by a woman who was sitting there, Mr. Franklin, what have you given us? This quote is in the front of many copies of the Constitution. His answer was, a republic, madam, if you can keep it, a republic.

But I thought we have a democracy. I don't know if we cite that Pledge of Allegiance just from rote and never think about what it says. But you remember those words in there, the republic for which it stands, not the democracy, but the republic for which it stands. What is the difference between a republic and a democracy and why did Benjamin Franklin make a point of telling this lady, a republic, madam, if you can keep it?

Let me give you a couple of examples of a democracy that will help you understand why he didn't say that they had given us a democracy. An example of a democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what they are going to have for dinner. You may smile a little because you know that if two wolves and a lamb are voting on what you are going to have for dinner, it is not going to be clover.

Another sample, and this is a very sad example, but if you think about it, this is really an apt example of a democracy, and that is a lynch mob. Because, clearly, in a lynch mob the will of the majority is being expressed, and that is what people say democracy is, that the majority rules.

So what is a republic? There is an incident in our history that helps me understand the difference between a republic and a democracy, and this happened during the Truman administration. The steel mills were going on strike, our economy was already in trouble, and it was going to be in bigger trouble if that strike occurred. Then we did some manufacturing, and we made some steel, and it mattered. Today, it probably wouldn't matter, because so little manufacturing in steel is made here, but it mattered then.

Harry Truman in his take-charge style issued an executive order, one of only two, by the way, that the Supreme Court has set aside. What he said in that executive order was that he nationalized the steel mills that made the steel mill workers civil servants, employees of the government. As employees to the government, they couldn't strike.

That was a very popular action that had very high approval from the American people. In a democracy, that

would have been just fine. But the Supreme Court met in an emergency session and, in effect, what they said, Mr. President, no matter how popular that is, you cannot do it because it violates the Constitution.

You see, the fundamental difference between a democracy and a republic is a rule of law. In a democracy, what the majority wants prevails. In a republic, it is a rule of law that prevails. Now, we can change that law. We have changed it 27 times. But it takes a very deliberative process, two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate, and then three-fourths of the State legislature. This is a long-time process. It gives a lot of time for reflection.

The last time we tried to amend the Constitution it didn't quite make it, the Equal Rights Amendment, you remember. Nobody denies that women should have equal rights with men. But what that amendment says, that you couldn't differentiate between men and women. If you had a draft, you would have to draft women.

We can change this Constitution, but it takes a very deliberative process and a super majority vote.

Then the last half of that statement, if you can keep it, I wonder what was in Benjamin Franklin's head, in his mind. Was he concerned about threats from outside our country? We were a long ocean away with sailing ships from any potential enemy. I doubt that his concern was a threat from without. I think that he was more concerned about a threat from within, a republic, madam, if you can keep it.

This needs a longer discussion, but that, too, is a discussion for another day. To really understand who we are, we need to go back to our origins and how our Founding Fathers came here. Most of them in our early days came from the British Isles and the European continent, and they came here to escape two tyrannies. One was the tyranny of the crown, and the other was the tyranny of the church.

Most of them came from countries where there was a king or an emperor who incredibly, from our perspective, claimed and was granted divine rights. What that says was the rights came from God to the king or the emperor, and he would give what rights he wished to his people. That is incomprehensible to us that for hundreds of years people could have lived under that kind of government.

Well, those who chose not to live that way came to this country. When they wrote the Bill of Rights, their concern about the tyranny of the crown gave rise to the second amendment.

Now, you may ask people what the second amendment is, and almost all of them will tell you that it says the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. That is about half of the second amendment.

Let me read the first part that puts that second part in perspective. A well-regulated militia, that is every citizen

with a gun, that is the militia, a well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state. I asked some of my friends, who wants to limit the right to keep and bear arms? What do you think that means?

Remember, they came here to escape the tyranny of the crown. If we have a citizenry who have the right to keep and bear arms, never, ever could a small oligarchy at the seat of government take over and oppress the people.

The second tyranny that they came here to escape was the tyranny of the church. In England, it was the Episcopal church. On the continent, it was the Roman church. In England, it was a state church, supported by the state, empowered by the state. On the continent, the Roman Catholic Church was the state church for many states, supported by the state and powered by the state, and these religions could and did oppress other religions.

Our Founding Fathers were so repulsed by this that when they came here in old Virginia they would not let Roman Catholics vote. But, to their great credit, when it came time to write these precious 10 amendments, they recognized that is not really what they came here to do. So they wrote the establishment clause of the first amendment, and it is very clear. I have no idea why people have trouble understanding it.

It says, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Don't make any law establishing a state religion.

Then they went on to say, and let everybody worship as they please, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. That is a really misunderstood establishment clause.

Early history books will present a very different picture of our origins than that which really existed. If you go back to a history book of 50 years ago, it will be unrecognizable as compared to the history book of today. The history books of today have been bled dry of any reference to our Christian heritage.

I would like to pause here for just a moment to note that I am going to quote from a lot of our Founding Fathers, and they are going to use the word "Christian." That was the lexicon of the day. If they were here today, they would be saying Judeo-Christian. Every time I read the word "Christian," please translate that Judeo-Christian, because that is the context in which they used that word.

Current history books, and indeed our culture, contains three great lies. The first of these lies is that our Founding Fathers were atheist and deist. Now an atheist is someone who does not believe in God. Deist, God, atheist, the alpha primitive, don't believe in God. A deist is someone who believes there is a God. They believe he created the world, but don't bother trying to talk to him or pray to him, because when he created the world he also put in place several laws, and your

destiny will be determined by how you relate yourself to your laws. Although they believed in a supreme being, they didn't believe he was a personal God or made any difference whether you tried to talk to him or not, and he certainly was not going to talk to you.

The second great lie is that our Founding Fathers did not want to establish a Christian Nation.

The third great lie is that they established a wall of separation between the church and the state.

Our national freedom was not free. It was enormously costly. Five of the 55 signers of the Declaration of Independence were captured and executed by the British, nine of them died on the battlefield of the Revolutionary War, and another dozen lost their homes and their possessions and their fortunes to British occupation. Our birth as a Nation was not cheap for these men. What beliefs and convictions motivated them to do what they did?

□ 1930

Of these three great lies, that is the wall of separation, it is very easy to dispense with a third of those because the words "separation," "church," and "State" never exist in relationship to each other in either our Constitution or the amendments.

But they do occur in one constitution. Interestingly, that is the constitution of the old Soviet empire, the constitution of the United Soviet Socialist Republic. Article 124 says: "In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the USSR is separated from the state and the schools from the church."

Now, many people would like to interpret the establishment clause of our first amendment as if it was written in these words that are found only in the constitution of the old Soviet Union.

To refute the first two lies, that is, that our Founding Fathers were athiests and deists and that they did not mean to establish a Christian nation, I want to do four things. First of all, I want to let the Founding Fathers speak for themselves. I am going to cite only a few quotes from the many, many that you could find. Then we are going to take a look at what the courts said and you will be astounded at what our courts said in our early years. And then we will take a look at what the Congress did. The institution permits me to speak here in the well of the Congress. And then we will take a look at our schools.

Patrick Henry was the firebrand of the Revolution. Every school child knows his words: "Give me liberty or give me death." But I will wager, Mr. Speaker, that you will not find in any current textbooks the circumstances in which he uttered these words: They were in a church in Richmond, Virginia, St. John's Church in Richmond Virginia March 23, 1775, and this is what he said: "An appeal to arms and the God of Hosts is all that is left us. But we shall not fight our battle alone.

There is a just God that presides over the destinies of nations. The battle, sir, is not to the strong. Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Did your children ever bring home to you this full quote from Patrick Henry?

Was Patrick Henry a Christian? The following year, 1776, he wrote this: "It cannot be emphasized too clearly and too often that this great Nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians," or in today's vernacular, Judeo Christians, "not on religion, but on the gospel of Jesus Christ. For that reason alone, peoples of other faiths have been afforded" . . . "freedom of worship here."

Benjamin Franklin was said to be a deist; that is, he believed there was a God who created the Earth but then he just let the Earth and its inhabitants determine their destiny by how they related themselves to laws that he had established. Let me read to you something that Benjamin Franklin said. This was in 1787. We had a deadlocked convention.

It wasn't certain that after 11 years, we were going to be able to write a Constitution that would protect all of the rights, big States and little States and people, that we wanted to protect. And this is what he said: "In the days of our conquest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity to establish our Nation. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Do we imagine we no longer need his assistance?"

And then I love this quote: "I have lived, sir, a long time." I believe he was 81 years old, the oldest member of the Constitutional Convention, revered Governor of Pennsylvania. "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, it is probable that a new nation cannot rise without his aid. We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that built it. I therefore beg leave to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to any business."

That, Mr. Speaker, established a precedent that we honored this morning when we opened this day and this Congress with prayer. We have a chaplain; so does the Senate. There is a

chaplain of every religious persuasion, or many, including Muslims, who serve our military. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the only place today we cannot offer a prayer is in our schools. I have often asked myself the rationality of this.

Thomas Jefferson was also said to be a deist. Let me read what he says and see if you believe he was a deist: "I am a real Christian, that is to say a disciple of the doctrines of Jesus. I have little doubt that our whole country will soon be rallied to the unity of our creator and, I hope, to the pure doctrine of Jesus also."

On slavery Jefferson wrote: "Almighty God has created men's minds free. Commerce between master and slave is despotism. I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever."

George Washington, the founder of our country, a deeply religious person. We think of him often as commander of the Army. This is his quote: "It is impossible to govern the world without God and the Bible." Boy, are we trying to do that? "Of all the dispositions and habits that lead to political prosperity, our religion and morality are the indispensable supporters. Let us with caution indulge the supposition," that is, the idea, "that morality can be maintained without religion. Reason and experience both forbid us to expect our national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

And in his prayer book, George Washington wrote this: "Oh, eternal and everlasting God, direct my thoughts, words, and work. Wash away my sins in the immaculate blood of the lamb and purge my heart by the Holy Spirit. Daily, frame me more and more in the likeness of thy son, Jesus Christ, that living in thy fear, and dying in thy favor, I may in thy appointed time obtain the resurrection of the justified unto eternal life. Bless, O Lord, the whole race of mankind and let the world be filled with the knowledge of thee and thy son, Jesus Christ."

John Adams, our second President and President of the American Bible Society, this is what he said: "We have no government armed with the power capable of contending with human passions, unbridled by morality and true religion." Mr. Speaker, I wonder if maybe this can be a factor in our problems in Iraq. "Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." This by the second President of the United States.

John Jay, our first Supreme Court Justice, said "Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty as well as the privilege and interest of our Christian Nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers." This from John Jay, the first Supreme Court Justice.

John Quincy Adams, also, like his father, President of the American Bible Society. As a matter of fact, I think it was he who said that he valued the

presidency of the American Bible Society more than he valued the presidency of the United States. This is what he said: "The highest glory of the American Revolution was this: It connected in one indissoluble bond the principles of civil government with the principles of Christianity. From the day of the Declaration, the day" the Founding Fathers "were bound by the Laws of God, which they all acknowledged as their rules of conduct."

And later Calvin Coolidge, "Silent Cal." An interesting story is told of him. He was a man of few words. It was hard to get him to talk. He was sitting at dinner with a lady who said, "I have a wager that I will get you to say three words tonight." And the only words he uttered that whole evening were "You lose."

Calvin Coolidge said this: "America seeks no empires built on blood and forces. She cherishes no purpose save to merit the favor of Almighty God." He later wrote: "The foundations of our society and our government rest so much on the teachings of the Bible that it would be difficult to support them if faith in these teaching would cease to be practically universal in our country."

President Coolidge, they have ceased to be practically universal in our country. What now?

I think, Mr. Speaker, you see from these quotes from just a few of our Founding Fathers, and there are dozens of others I could have brought, that certainly our Founding Fathers were deeply religious people. They were not deists and athiests.

Now let us move to the Supreme Court. Some of these quotes will shock you. The People versus Ruggles. He had publicly slandered the Bible, and somehow this came to the Supreme Court in 1811. "You have attacked the Bible." This is what the Supreme Court said: "You have attacked the Bible. In attacking the Bible, you have attacked Jesus Christ. In attacking Jesus Christ, you have attacked the roots of our Nation."

Did they intend this to be a Godless Nation?

"Whatever strikes at the root of Christianity manifests itself in the dissolving of our civil government. This was the Supreme Court. And then the same Court a little later, in 1885, in *Vida versus Gerrard*, they were using the Bible in teaching one of our schools, and somehow that got to the Supreme Court. And this is what they said: "Why not use the Bible, especially the New Testament? It should be read and taught as the divine revelation in the schools. Where can the purist principles of morality be learned so clearly and so perfectly as from the New Testament?" Can you imagine anything like that coming from our Court today?

And then in 1892, and this was in a suit involving the Church of the Holy Spirit in which they contended Christianity was not the faith of the people,

and this is what the Supreme Court said in 1892: "Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the redeemer of mankind. It is impossible to demand that they should be otherwise; and in this sense and to this extent, our civilization and our institutions are emphatically Christian. No purpose of action against our religion can be imputed to any legislation, State or national, because this is a religious people." This is the Supreme Court. "This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to this present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation." And then they go on to cite 87 different legal precedents to affirm that America was formed as a Christian Nation by believing Christians.

And then in 1947, our Court did an about face, 180 degrees, repudiating everything they have they had done for 160 years. And you will see no Supreme Court reference today going back beyond 1947 because if you went back beyond that, every one would be consistent with the quotes that I have read here.

We are having trouble understanding that what our Founding Fathers meant in this great establishment clause in the first amendment was to ensure that there would be freedom of religion. We are ever more interpreting this as requiring freedom from religion. Our Founding Fathers would be astounded if they could be resurrected and see how we have interpreted their Constitution.

□ 1945

In the early 1850s, Humanism and Darwinism was sweeping our country. And there was the assertion that America was not a Christian Nation. After a year's study, now we are turning to the Congress. After a year's study, this is what the Senate Judiciary Committee said in its final report in March 27, 1854.

"The First Amendment clause speaks against an establishment of religion. The founding fathers intended by this amendment to prohibit an establishment of religion, such as the Church of England presented or anything like it. But they had no fear or jealousy of religion itself, nor did they wish to see us an illreligious people." And I love the language that our founding fathers used, so poetic.

"They did not intend to spread over the public authorities and the whole public action of the Nation the dead and revolting spectacle of atheistic apathy. Had the people during the revolution had a suspicion of any attempt to war against Christianity, that revolution would have been strangled in its cradle."

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and the amendments, the universal sentiment was that Christianity should be encouraged, not just any one sect or denomination. The object was not to substitute Judaism, or

Islam or infidelity, but to prevent rivalry among the Christian denominations to the exclusion of others. Christianity must be considered as the foundation on which the whole structure rests.

"Laws will not have permanence or power without the sanction of religious sentiment, without the firm belief that there is power above us that will reward our virtues and punish our vices." This is what our Congress said.

The Continental Congress bought 20,000 copies of the Bible to distribute to its new citizens. And for the first 100 years of our country, every year our Congress voted monies to send missionaries to the American Indians.

Continuing the Senate Judiciary Committee's 1854 reading. "In this age, there can be no substitute for Christianity. By its general principles, the Christian faith is the great conserving element on which we must rely for the purity and permanence of our free institutions."

That was the religion of our founding fathers, or the Republic, and they expected it to remain the religion of their descendants. Well, there is little question, little question how the Congress felt, and the courts.

Let us turn now to our schools. Oh, by the way. The same Congress in 1854 passed this resolution. Can you imagine this today? "The Congress of the United States recommends and approves the Holy Bible for use in our schools."

The New England Primer used for 200 years. This is how they taught the alphabet. A. A wise son makes a glad father but a foolish son is heaviness to his mother.

B. Better is little with the fear of the Lord than abundance apart from him. C. Come unto Christ, all you who are weary and heavily laden. D. Do not do the abominable thing, which I hate, sayeth the Lord. E. Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God. Clearly religion was important in our early schools.

The McGuffey Reader, used for a hundred years. A few years ago they brought it back with the hope that if kids used that, they could read, because what they were doing today they were not learning to read.

This is what McGuffey said. "The Christian religion is the religion of our country. From it are derived our notions of the character of God, on the great moral Governor of universe. On its doctrines are founded the peculiarities of our free institutions. From no source has the author drawn more conspicuously than from the sacred Scriptures. For all of those extracts from the Bible, I make no apology."

Of the first 108 universities in our country, 106 were distinctly religious. Harvard University, the first university. This was in their student handbook. Let me read it. "Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well, the main end of his life and studies is, to

know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life, John 17:3; and therefore to lay Jesus Christ as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning."

For more than 100 years, more than 50 percent of all Harvard's graduates were pastors. We now have exposed these three great lies from our founding fathers, from our courts, from our Congress, from our schools. Our founding fathers have all spoken. Clearly we were founded by religious people intending to be a religious Nation.

What have we reaped in the way we have changed? America 100 years ago had the highest literacy rate of any nation. Today we spend more on education than any nation in the world. And yet since 1987 we have graduated more than one million high school students who could not even read their diploma.

We have spent more money than any other Nation in the industrialized world to educate our children, and yet SAT scores fell for 24 straight years before finally leveling off at the bottom, where they still are compared with others in the world in the 1990s.

In a 1960 survey 53 percent of America's teenagers had never kissed. 57 percent said they had never necked, that is kissing and hugging, and 92 percent of teenagers in America said they were virgins in 1960.

Before that, more than a decade before that, I was getting my doctorate at the University of Maryland. The girls dorm was right down the hill from Moral Hall where I did my work. The Dean of Women would not let the girls go barefoot because she said that bare feet were too sexy.

There are far too many coed dorms and coed rooms in the University of Maryland today. By 1990, just 30 years later, 75 percent of American high school students are sexually active, by 18. In the next 5 years, we spent \$4 billion to educate them on how to be immoral, to trumpeting the solutions of safe sex, and it worked.

One in five teenagers in America today lose their virginity before their 13th birthday. 19 percent of America's teenagers say they have had more than four sexual partners before graduation. The result: Every day 2,700 students get pregnant, 1,100 get abortions, 1,200 give birth. Every day another 900 contract a sexually transmitted disease, many incurable.

AIDS infections among high school students climbed 700 percent between 1990 and 1995. We have 3.3 million problem drinkers in our high school campuses, over half a million alcoholics, and in any given weekend in America, 30 percent of the student population may spend some time drunk.

A few years ago a young woman in a high school in Oklahoma wrote this poem as a new school prayer. "Now I sit me down in school where praying is against the rule, for this great Nation under God finds mention of him very odd.

"The Scripture now the class recites, it violates the Bill of Rights. And any

time my head I bow, becomes a Federal matter now. Our hair can be purple, orange or green, that is no offense, it is a freedom scene. The law is specific, the law is precise, only prayers spoken out loud are a serious vice.

"For praying in a public hall might offend someone with no faith at all, in silence alone we must meditate, God's name is prohibited by the State. We are allowed to cuss and dress like freaks, and pierce our noses, tongues and cheeks, they have outlawed guns but first the Bible.

"To quote the Good Book makes me liable. We can elect a pregnant senior queen, and the unwed daddy our senior king. It is inappropriate to teach right from wrong, we are taught that such judgments do not belong.

"We can get our condoms and birth control, study witchcraft, vampires and totem poles, but the Ten Commandments are not allowed. No word of God must reach this crowd. It is scary here I must confess, when chaos reins the school is a mess.

"So Lord this silent plea I make, should I be shot my soul please take."

Our Nation which used to lead the world in every arena now leads the world in these areas. Number one in violent crime. We are number one in divorce. We are number one in teenage pregnancies. We are number one in volunteer abortions. We are number one in illegal drug abuse. And we are number one in the industrialized world for illiteracy.

Alexis de Tocqueville, a great, young Frenchman, toured our country for 5 years. He wrote a great two-volume treatise on democracy, which is still a classic. And this is what he said. "In the United States, the influence of religion is not confined to the manners, but shapes the intelligence of the people. Christianity, therefore reigns without obstacle, by universal consequence. The consequence is, as I have before observed, that every principle in a moral world is fixed and enforced."

And this great quote. "I sought for the key to the greatness of and genius of America in her great harbors, her fertile fields and boundless forests, in her rich minds and vast world commerce, in her universal public school system and institutions of learning.

"I sought for it in her Democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution. But not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power."

He said, "America is great, because America is good. And if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

In 1963, Abraham Lincoln declared a National Day of Humiliation. And this is what he said. "We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers and wealth and power, as no other Nation has ever

grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched us.

"And we have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace.

"Too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us then to humble us ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

Abraham Lincoln understood that this was a new experiment that might not succeed. In the Gettysburg Address he says this. "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth in this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

That may sound very strange to us, and this should be unusual. But remember, they came from countries that had a king or an Emperor. "We are now engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any Nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

We have forgotten from whence we came. Actually this generation has not forgotten, it never knew. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this great free country, the undisputed economic and military super power of the world is at risk if we have forgotten from whence we came.

Abraham Lincoln said this to our Nation, and I will close with this. We need to hear it again. "For all those who have died in all of our wars, it is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great tasks remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause to which they gave the last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARR (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until 3 p.m. on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMBORN, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reports that on January 30, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 188. To provide a new effective date for the applicability of certain provisions of law to Public Law 105-331.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 41, 110th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 41, 110th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 5, 2007.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 41, the House adjourned until Monday, February 5, 2007, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

475. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Annual Gasparilla Marine Parade, Hillsborough Bay, Tampa, FL [CGD 07-05-156] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

476. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; East Rockaway Inlet to Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island,

New York [CGD01-06-142] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

477. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Southern Boulevard (SR 700/80) Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1024.7, Palm Beach, FL [CGD07-06-130] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

478. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Darby Creek, Essington, PA [CGD05-06-086] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

479. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bayou Lafourche, LA [CGD08-06-028] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

480. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Arkansas Waterway, Arkansas [CGD08-06-005] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

481. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, Washington, DC and Arlington and Fairfax Counties, VA [CGD05-06-120] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

482. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Choptank River, Cambridge, MD [CGD05-06-121] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

483. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Escorted Vessels in the Captain of the Port Jacksonville Zone [COTP Jacksonville 06-276] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

484. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone, Elba Island LNG mooring Slip, Savannah River, Savannah, Georgia [COTP Savannah 06-160] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

485. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Surrounding U.S. Forces Vessel SBX-1, HI [COTP Honolulu 06-008] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

486. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Transit of Industrial Cranes, Cape Fear River, Wilmington, North Carolina [CGD05-07-123] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

487. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chicago New Years Eve Fireworks, Lake Michigan, Chicago, IL [CGD09-06-173] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

488. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project, Bridge Deck Lifting Beams [CGD13-06-054] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

489. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project, Construction Barge "MARMACK 12" [CGD13-06-053] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

490. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction Project, Construction Vessels and Equipment Under and in Immediate Vicinity of West Span [CGD13-06-052] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REICHERT, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H.R. 740. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent caller ID spoofing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BEAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 741. A bill to provide for the expansion of Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 742. A bill to amend the Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, to extend the term of the Antitrust Modernization Commission and to make a technical

correction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MACK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. FARR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HOOLEY, and Ms. HERSTETH):

H.R. 743. A bill to make the moratorium on Internet access taxes and multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce permanent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 744. A bill to enhance congressional oversight of Operation Iraqi Freedom by requiring the President to transmit periodically to Congress a consolidated, comprehensive report to detail the terms of completion for Operation Iraqi Freedom and by requiring the President to seek to enter into a multilateral agreement to help provide for the completion of Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 745. A bill to revise the short title of the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. LEE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 746. A bill to provide for the safe and orderly withdrawal of United States military forces and Department of Defense contractors from Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 747. A bill to establish a National Foreign Language Coordination Council; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 748. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 749. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to improve choices available to Medicare eligible seniors by permitting them to elect (instead of regular Medicare benefits) to receive a voucher for a health savings account, for premiums for a high deductible health insurance plan, or both and by suspending Medicare late enrollment penalties between ages 65 and 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 750. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to comprehensively reform immigration law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 751. A bill to expedite payments of certain Federal emergency assistance authorized pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to exercise certain authority provided under such Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 752. A bill to direct Federal agencies to donate excess and surplus Federal electronic equipment, including computers, computer components, printers, and fax machines, to qualifying small towns, counties, schools, nonprofit organizations, and libraries; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 753. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Clifford Davis/Odell Horton Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CUBIN (for herself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 754. A bill to designate the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located at 2820 Rungius Road, Jackson, Wyoming, as the National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FEENEY):

H.R. 755. A bill to require annual oral testimony before the Financial Services Committee of the Chairperson or a designee of the Chairperson of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, relating to their efforts to promote transparency in financial reporting; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 756. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to direct the Election Assistance Commission to develop and adopt guidelines for electronic poll books in the same manner as the Commission develops

and adopts voluntary voting system guidelines under the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H.R. 757. A bill to allow United States nationals and permanent residents to visit family members in Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 758. A bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies, lumpectomies, and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 759. A bill to redesignate the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 760. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 761. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to convey to The Missouri River Basin Lewis and Clark Interpretive Trail and Visitor Center Foundation, Inc. certain Federal land associated with the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail in Nebraska, to be used as an historical interpretive site along the trail; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 762. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for voluntary contributions on a grant basis to the Organization of American States (OAS) to establish a Center for Caribbean Basin Trade and to establish a skills-based training program for Caribbean Basin countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTUÑO:

H.R. 763. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction allowable with respect to income attributable to domestic production activities in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.R. 764. A bill to expand the boundary of Saguaro National Park, to study additional land for future adjustments to the boundary of the Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and extend the alternative motor vehicle credit for certain flexible fuel hybrid vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDEN:

H.R. 766. A bill to waive the time limitations specified by law in order to allow the Medal of Honor to be awarded posthumously to Richard L. Etchberger of Hamburg, Pennsylvania, for acts of valor on March 11, 1968, while an Air Force Chief Master Sergeant serving in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 767. A bill to protect, conserve, and restore native fish, wildlife, and their natural habitats at national wildlife refuges through

cooperative, incentive-based grants to control, mitigate, and eradicate harmful non-native species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.R. 768. A bill to provide that Executive Order 13166 shall have no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California):

H.R. 769. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 770. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to carry out any covert action for the purpose of causing regime change in Iran or to carry out any military action against Iran in the absence of an imminent threat, in accordance with international law and constitutional and statutory requirements for congressional authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H.R. 771. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Southern California Desert Region Integrated Water and Economic Sustainability Plan; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 772. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize capitation grants to increase the number of nursing faculty and students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 773. A bill to reduce and prevent the sale and use of fraudulent degrees in order to protect the integrity of valid higher education degrees that are used for Federal purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H.R. 774. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of grants for rape prevention education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 775. A bill making supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and requiring the President to submit a request for additional funding after certifying substantial progress has been made in Iraq in meeting certain performance measures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 776. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 777. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf in the Mid-Atlantic and North Atlantic planning areas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the residential energy efficient property credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to double the damages, fines, and penalties for the unauthorized inspection or disclosure of returns and return information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 780. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to counterfeit drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 781. A bill to redesignate Lock and Dam No. 5 of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System near Redfield, Arkansas, authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act approved July 24, 1946, as the "Colonel Charles D. Maynard Lock and Dam"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr.

ALTMIRE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. FOX, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPACE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 782. A bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that exchange-rate misalignment by any foreign nation is a countervailable export subsidy, to amend the Exchange Rates and International Economic Policy Coordination Act of 1988 to clarify the definition of manipulation with respect to currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 783. A bill to modify the boundary of Mesa Verde National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASITOR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PORTUÑO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. REYES, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 784. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the effective date for paid-up coverage under the military Survivor Benefit Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 785. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an Inspector General for the judicial branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 786. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Los Angeles County Water Supply Augmentation Demonstration Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 787. A bill to state United States policy for Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 788. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to drug

safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 789. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Men's Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 790. A bill to provide permanent funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 791. A bill to increase the renewable fuel content of gasoline sold in the United States by the year 2025 to 25 billion gallons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 792. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to direct the head of each Federal agency to ensure that, in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline is reasonably available at a generally competitive price, the Federal agency purchases ethanol-blended gasoline containing at least 10 percent ethanol rather than nonethanol-blended gasoline, for use in vehicles used by the agency that use gasoline; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the renewable electricity production credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for electricity produced from wind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution recognizing the efforts and contributions of the members of the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives program under the Civil Affairs and Military Government Sections of the United States Armed Forces during and following World War II who were responsible for the preservation, protection, and restitution of artistic and cultural treasures in countries occupied by the Allied armies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Military Order of the Purple Heart and commending recipients of the Purple Heart for their courageous demonstrations of gallantry and heroism on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of Venezuela to uphold the human rights and civil liberties of the people of Venezuela; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Wear Red Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GERLACH):

H. Res. 117. A resolution honoring the contributions of Barbaro to the Commonwealths of Kentucky and Pennsylvania and to America's horseracing industry; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BLUNT):

H. Res. 118. A resolution condemning the existence of racially restrictive covenants in housing documents and urging States adopt legislation similar to that which was enacted in California to address the issue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. POE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Res. 119. A resolution supporting the mission and goals of National Crime Victims' Rights Week in order to increase public awareness of the rights, needs, and concerns of victims and survivors of crime in the United States during such week and throughout the year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. CASTOR, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 120. A resolution recognizing the African American spiritual as a national treasure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HARE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. WU):

H. Res. 121. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Japan should formally

acknowledge, apologize, and accept historical responsibility in a clear and unequivocal manner for its Imperial Armed Force's coercion of young women into sexual slavery, known to the world as "comfort women", during its colonial and wartime occupation of Asia and the Pacific Islands from the 1930s through the duration of World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WU, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 122. A resolution recognizing the significance of the 65th anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and supporting the goals of the Japanese American, German American, and Italian American communities in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance to increase public awareness of the events surrounding the restriction, exclusion, and internment of individuals and families during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H. Res. 123. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Kidney Cancer Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 795. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLDEN:

H.R. 796. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Richard D. Winters, of Hershey, Pennsylvania, for acts of valor on June 6, 1944, in Normandy, France, while an officer in the 101st Airborne Division; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 17: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. KIND, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 22: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 25: Mr. AKIN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 36: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 37: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 65: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 87: Mr. PITTS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 89: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 100: Mr. McCAUL of Texas and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 101: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 111: Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 180: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 191: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 192: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 195: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 196: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 197: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 205: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 207: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 210: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 211: Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.

H.R. 241: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 249: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 274: Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 279: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 281: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 303: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 312: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 322: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 332: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. FOX.

H.R. 333: Mr. EDWARDS and Ms. ZOE LOFGREEN of California.

H.R. 359: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 365: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ROSS, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 370: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 380: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 395: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. McHUGH.

H.R. 411: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. FOX, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. POE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 418: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 423: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McHUGH, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 446: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 461: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 463: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 468: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. STARK, Ms. LEE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 486: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. Fortuño, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 491: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 493: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 503: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LoBiondo, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WU, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 506: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 507: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WYNN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 508: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 510: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 511: Mr. GOODE, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. McKEON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 512: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. LEE, Ms. DeLauro, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 522: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 526: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 539: Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 542: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. REYES, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 545: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 549: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 553: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 556: Mr. CLAY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WATT, and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 566: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 569: Mr. SIREN and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 579: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 584: Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 588: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 590: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 608: Mr. BUYER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 618: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 620: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 625: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 628: Mr. KELLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 631: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 634: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAY-

LOR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HARE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BACA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. DREIER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. McGovern, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. McKEON, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DICKS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 635: Mr. KIRK and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 649: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 651: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 653: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 656: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 661: Mr. CLAY and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 670: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 677: Mr. COSTA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 684: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 690: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HARE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 698: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.R. 699: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 706: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 711: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 713: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 714: Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 720: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 724: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 725: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 737: Ms. HIRONO.

H.J. Res. 3: Mr. WAMP.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.J. Res. 16: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. McNerney.

H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BACA.

H. Con. Res. 21: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. PITTS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 35: Ms. WATSON.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. WATT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H. Res. 37: Mr. REYES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr.

GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 54: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H. Res. 55: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. CARSON.

H. Res. 71: Mr. BACA and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 72: Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Res. 94: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 100: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 101: Mr. SIRES, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 106: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KIRK, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CROWLEY,

Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BACA, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HARE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr.

LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SIRES, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McKEON, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. BEAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DENT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 109: Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 113: Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Res. 106: Mr. JINDAL.